THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST

Volume IV OCTOBER, 1941 Number 4

BALDASSARE BONIFACIO AND HIS ESSAY *DE ARCHIVIS*

ALL is ephemeral, even fame and the famous, as Marcus Aurelius observed some seventeen hundred years ago. The soundness of this truism is only too well illustrated by Baldassare Bonifacio, citizen of the Venetian Republic, jurisconsult, college professor and president, bishop, and *littérateur* extraordinary. Never canonized by inclusion within the scholarly confines of any edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, unavenged for such slight by recognition from the *Enciclopedia italiana*, which could make no place for him within its thirty-odd huge volumes, Bonifacio finds almost his sole champions in recent times to be the Messrs. Lippincott, who have granted him four and one-half lines (without mention of his status as educator or lawyer) in their estimable volume, the *Universal Pronouncing Dictionary of Biography and Mythology*. In fact, the most recent biographical sketch which can claim to be more than a notice is that by Ginguené in the *Biographie universelle*, edition of 1812.[1]

[1] Inasmuch as so little is readily ascertainable concerning Bonifacio, a list of works employed may not be without interest. The factual information of the introductory remarks is based upon them unless specifically noted otherwise.

1. *Bibliotheca Aprosiana* . . . (Bologna, 1673), 502-512. Much about literary activities, friends, personal enemies, etc.; filled with source references; no details of teaching, bishopric, etc.
2. König, Georg, *Bibliotheca vetus et nova* . . . (Altdorf, 1678), 123; 8 lines. No dates or details; some references to works.
3. Ughelli, Ferdinando, *Italia sacra; sive, De episcopis Italiae* . . . (Venice, 1720), V, 393. Scant details of bishopric alone; epitaphs.
4. Fabricius, Johann, *Historiae bibliothecae Fabricianae* . . . (Wolfenbüttel, 1722), V, 498. His sources did not complete Bonifacio's life.
5. Nicéron, Jean P., *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustrés* . . . (Paris, 1731), XVI, 366-378. Full details, some literary criticism, a list of works, etc.
6. Morhof, Daniel George, *Polyhistor* . . . (3d ed., Lübeck, 1732), I, 244, 316, 317, 940, 1070. Literary criticism.
7. *Grosses vollständiges universal Lexikon aller Wissenschaften und Künste* . . . (Halle and Leipzig, 1733), IV, 618. Generous details, list of authorities.
8. Jöcher, Chr. Gottlieb, *Allgemeines gelehrten-lexicon* . . . (Leipzig, 1750), I, 1233. Some details not found in others; little on quality of work, epitaphs, personality, etc.
9. Clement, David, *Bibliothèque curieuse, ou catalogue raisonné de livres difficiles à trouver* (Hannover, 1754), V, 72-75. Much on the rarity of Bonifacio's works; quotations from other book authorities, etc.

Baldassare Bonifacio was born at Crema, in the province of Cremona, January 5, 1586, the son of Bonifacio Bonifacio, celebrated[2] jurisconsult and assessor, and of Paula Carniani, the daughter of Giovanni Francisco Carniani, likewise jurisconsult and assessor. Baldassare owes his given name to the fact that he and his two brothers—triplets—were named for the three wise kings, Balthazar, Melchior, and Gaspard. Obviously a precocious child, Baldassare was sent to the University of Padua at the age of thirteen. After a sojourn of five years he departed, *utriusque juris doctor*, a doctor of civil and canon law.

Sometime within the next five years, young Bonifacio accompanied Count Giralomo di Porzia, bishop of Andria and papal nuncio, to Germany as a private secretary. In this office he must have conducted himself creditably, for it was the first of a long line of public and ecclesiastical preferments to be shown him in short order. Upon his return to the Venetian Republic he was made archpriest of Rovigo, his ancestral seat, and seems to have expounded the Institutes at the local academy.

On October 3, 1619, Bonifacio was named professor of Greek and

---

10. *Nouveau dictionnaire historique* . . . (7th ed., Paris, 1789), II, 181; 16 lines.
11. *A new genealogical and biographical dictionary* (New ed., enl., London, 1798), II, 458; 8½ lines. Taken verbatim from 10.
12. Ginguené, Pierre Louis, in *Biographie universelle* . . . (Paris, 1812), V, 117-120. One of the best single sources; not all inclusive.
13. *Dictionnaire historique et bibliographique* (Paris, 1822), I, 289; 8 lines.
14. Ersch, J. S., and J. G. Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste* . . . (Leipzig, 1823), XI, 390. Mostly concerned with works; lists sources not given elsewhere.
15. *Encyclopedie catholique* . . . (Paris, n.d.), IV, 44, 45. Verbatim copy of 14 except for omission of several phrases.
16. Blake, J. L., *A general biographical dictionary* . . . (New York, 1835), 139; 8 lines.
17. A'Beckett, Wm., *A universal biography* . . . (London, 1836), I, 491; 11 lines.
18. *Biographie universelle* . . . (Paris, 1848), II, 101; less than one column. Unsigned; apparently condensed from 12.
19. Rose, H. J., *A new general biographical dictionary* (London, 1850), IV, 419; 12½ lines. Seven lines are devoted to the reason for Bonifacio's Christian name!
20. Marani, A. C., in *The Imperial Dictionary of Universal Biography* (London, 1863), I, 670. Except for a reference to Clement, *loc. cit.*, contains nothing not also found in 12.
21. *Pierers Universal-conversations-lexikon* (Leipzig, 1875), III, 664; 17 lines.
22. *La grande encyclopedie* (Paris, n.d.), VII, 300; 12 lines signed G.L.
23. *Enciclopedia universal ilustrada europeo-americana* . . . (Barcelona, n.d.), IX, 15; 13 lines.
24. [Lippincott's] *Universal Pronouncing Dictionary of Biography and Mythology* (Philadelphia, 1886), 427; 4½ lines.

Items 15-23 obviously contribute nothing. They are included as evidence of Bonifacio's disappearance over the horizon of scholarly vision.

[2] So says Nicéron, *loc. cit.*, but he is nowhere known at present.

Latin literature at the University of Padua, but he refused this post, preferring, according to Nicéron, "the pleasure of teaching himself, to the trouble of teaching others."[3] In the next year the Venetian senate offered him the position of professor of civil law at the academy in Venice.[4] At the time of his acceptance he was in Rome. Before his return Pope Urban VIII, upon the recommendation of the Republic of Venice, named him to the bishopric of Setia and Hierapetra on the island of Candia. This honor Bonifacio refused because of his health. As partial compensation, the pope appointed him to the archdeaconate of Treviso in his native Venice, in which office he served four successive bishops.

In 1636, the Venetian Republic created a new academy for the sons of the nobility at Padua. By public decree, it named Bonifacio director and first rector, at a handsome stipend, of the new institution which was formally opened in 1637. How long he held this position I do not know. Nicéron says that he directed the academy for only a short time,[5] after which he was succeeded by Francisco Bernardino Ferrari of Milan. Jöcher, on the other hand, writing nearly twenty years later, explicitly says that the academy was disbanded,[6] and that Bonifacio was therefore free to assume his last public position, that of bishop of Justinopolis, at Capo d'Istria, near Trieste.

Appointed thirty-eighth bishop of the see of Justinopolis (which had been founded in 756) on November 24, 1653, Bonifacio devoted his last years to the generous embellishment of his charge, and to his duties as advisor to the Inquisition for the church of Treviso. Safely past his allotted three score years and ten,[7] Bonifacio died in 1659 and was buried in his cathedral church, close by the altar of the Epiphany (which he had privately contributed), in a tomb marked by this epitaph:

> Balthasaris Bonifacii Cornianii, S. Theol. & J.U.D. Episcopi Justinopolitani, & Comitis, qui plurimos libros in utraque lingua conscripsit, quidquid fuerat mortale, hic ad pedes recens nati Salvatoris, eiusque Virginis Matris humillime iacet. Vixit an. 75. Obiit
> MDCLIX[8]

[3] *Loc. cit.*

[4] His inaugural address is extant and separately published: *Oratio cum inciperet jus civile in Gymnasio Veneto interpretari* (Venice, 1632).

[5] *Loc. cit.*

[6] *Loc. cit.:* "Als sich aber solch Kollegium nach der Zeit wieder zerschlug und vom Rath gar aufgehoben wurde. . . ."

[7] Most sources give his birth date as 1586, others say about 1584.

[8] Ughelli, *loc. cit.:* Of Baldassare Bonifacio-Corniani, Doctor of Sacred Theology and

In the following year his canons erected an appreciative memorial in the choir of the same church:

> Balthassari Bonifacio, Pontificum optimo, Literatorum maximo, qui pietate immensa distributionum mensam, Canonicatum, Clericatum suo aere instituendo, Ecclesiam sponsam inopem dotavit, ditavit,
> Canonici posuere.
> MDCLX[9]

The elegiac encomium composed by Bonifacio's contemporary, the distinguished Danish scholar, Thomas Bartholin, excels both of these in certain respects.

> Balthazar hic situs est, doctus, pius atque poeta,
> Qui *bene* multa *facit*, sed moriendo male.[10]

Because of its rare quality, a quality to which some think Bonifacio also attained, it forms a fitting transition to the brief discussion of his literary achievements.

The first of Bonifacio's printed works, which total more than thirty in number,[11] is that written under the pseudonymn of Pietro-Antonio Salmone, and bearing the imprint of Paris, but really issued at Padua. There is reason to this apparent mystery. Baldassare's uncle, Giovanni Bonifacio, lawyer, historian, and writer, had written to the bishop of Andria—the same Count Porzia whose secretary Baldassare had been—requesting the removal of the relics of St. Bellino from Padua to the cathedral at Rovigo. A hornet's nest would seem quiet in comparison to the public result of this request, and Baldassare took up his pen in the cause.[12]

In close succession there follows a stream of Italian and Latin

---

of Canon and Civil Law, Bishop of Capo d'Istria, and Count, author of numerous books in both languages, all that was mortal here lies most humbly at the feet of the new-born Savior and His virgin mother. He lived 75 years. He died 1659.

[9] *Ibid.:* To Baldassare Bonifacio, best of bishops, greatest of writers, who, out of the depths of his piety established from his own funds the distribution table, the chapter of canons and the clergy, endowed and enriched his unmoneyed espoused church, the canons have erected this. 1660.

[10] At the risk of making bad worse, I have made this bad verse:

> Here lies Balthazar, the learned, the pious, the poet:
> Welldon(e) so often was he; dying he failed us alone.

[11] A list is given at the end of the second edition of the *Historia ludicra.* Some twenty-odd items, in Italian and Latin alike, still remain unpublished and in the hands of the family according to Ginguené, *loc. cit.*, and others.

[12] *Difesa dell' "Oratione" del sig. Gio. Bonifaccio, . . . per lo trasporto in Rovigo del corpo di San Bellino, contra le ragion; del cavallier Battista Guarino, con le quali cerca d'impedirlo, di Pietr' Antonio Salmone, . . . (Parigi, 1609).*

poems, essays on a wide variety of subjects, in either language, letters, and historical works. His first poems, published jointly with those of a close friend, appeared in 1618, under a title typical of the period which sought a strained allusion in everything: *Castore e Polluce, rime di Baldassare Bonifacio e di Gio. Maria Vanti.* The following year saw the publication of *Stichidicon libri XVIII,* a collection of poems, the stilted nature of which can easily be appreciated from a few headings of the individual books: Propylon (Gateway), Erotarion (Abode of Love), Rhina (The File), Ptocos (The Beggar), Cyclaminus (Cyclamen). His one trial of the buskin resulted in *Amata: tragedia,* published at Venice in 1622. Crescimbeni, in his *Storia della poesia italiana,* written in the next generation, praises this as one of the best of its day. Other judgments upon Bonifacio's poetry, which includes a second collection in ten books under the title *Musarum seu latinorum poematum . . .*, published in 1646, are not so generous. Daniel George Morhof, for example, says he was the "writin'est man" (*scribacissimus*), and that "his droppings, like those of the eagle, smell neither good nor bad."[13]

The *Discorso dell' immortalità dell' anima* (Venice, 1621), defended in the next year by *Lettere poetiche,* the *Dell' Aristocrazia* (1620), the *Elogia Contarena* (1623), in which Bonifacio eulogizes some thirty members of the Contarini family, his excerpts (1627) from Carlo Sigonio's book on Roman historians, a biography of his father (1629), and *Prælectiones et civilium institutionum epitome* (1632) show further how Bonifacio occupied himself while teaching the humanities and the law, while filling clerical positions.

After assuming his bishopric he wrote *Panegirici sacri* (1657), but his most significant single work, the *Historia ludicra, opus ex omni disciplinarum genere selectum et jucunda eruditione refertum,*[14] was published in the year preceding that appointment. The second

[13] *Op. cit.,* 1070. For other judgments on the poetry, see the main sources listed above, who substantially echo Morhof's statement that "some things are good, some are inept, as is wont to happen in the case of extemporaneous work."

[14] Clement, *loc. cit.,* quotes Struvius, *Bibliotheca antiqua* (Jena, 1706), 444: "This a philological work, of varied erudition, in which the author exhibits many excerpts, now serious, now humorous, . . . but with no established order." Of this miscellany, in twenty books, which resulted from the author's wide reading, Nicéron, *loc. cit.,* says: "Il y a néanmoins beaucoup d'érudition, & il peut être utile à bien des Sçavans d'une certaine espece." Of Bonifacio's work as a whole he says, "Bonifacio a beaucoup écrit, mais son stile est peu châtié, et quoiqu'il eût de l'érudition, il y a peu d'exactitude dans ses ouvrages."

edition (Brussels, 1659), published in the year of its author's death, contains a full list of his writings, and a biography translated into Latin out of the Italian of *Le glorie degli Incogniti,*[15] *overe gli huomini illustri dell' Accademia dei Signori Incogniti di Venetia* (Venice, 1647), which is the ultimate source for many of the details of Bonifacio's life.

It is little wonder, in view of the multiformed professional and private life of its author which we have just passed in review, that the essay, *On Archives,* published in 1632[16] at the mid-point of his career, should be what it is, a typical humanistic *Kabinettstück.* Bonifacio's classical erudition is evidenced not only by the general concept of his brief essay, but by the twenty-five specific references to ancient sources, a number which could be enlarged by the inclusion of the seven references to Roman legal writers. His legal knowledge is attested by his ready use of the *Corpus juris,* just indicated, and by his mention of later jurisconsults and their works. The catholicity of his tastes in reading is undoubtedly responsible for the references to papal literature, synodical minutes, Christian texts, and travel.[17] Perhaps the earliest extant independent essay[18]—certainly one of the earliest—on the subject of archives, it is eminently worth examining as an example of the new genre of literature that sprang up, almost full-born, in the first part of the seventeenth century. In its own right it also deserves attention for its various sound observations on theory and practice. The translation follows:

[15] The Incogniti (Venice) is only one of several professional and learned societies to which Bonifacio belonged. The others are the Olympici (Verona), Humanistae (Rome), Philarmonici, and Solliciti. This last was founded by Bonifacio himself at Treviso.

[16] *De archivis liber singularis ad amplissimum senatorem Dominicum Molinum* (Venetiis, 1632, apud J. P. Pinellum, typographum ducalem). This also appears in J. J. Mader, *Syntagma scriptorum variorum de bibliothecis atque archivis* (Helmstad, 1666). The second edition, which I have used, bears the title, *De bibliothecis atque archivis virorum clarissimorum libelli et commentationes . . .* (Helmstad, 1702). It is also found in G. Poleni, *Utriusque thesauri antiquitatum . . . supplementa* (Venice, 1737), and in Jacob Wencker (who issued several archival works), *Collecta archivi et cancellariae jura.* Senator Molino, to whom Bonifacio dedicated at least three other works besides this, was, according to his epitaph, a man who bent all his efforts to preserve the majesty of the Republic of Venice, and to augment the glory of literature. Like Bonifacio, he now receives no notice.

[17] Some of the citations—at least as given in the second edition—are inexact.

[18] Eugenio Casanova, *Archivistica* (2d ed., Siena, 1928), 378-380, in discoursing on the writers of the seventeenth century, mentions Bonifacio first, then Albertino Barisone (*Commentarii de archivis antiquorum*), then Fortunato Olmo, abbot of Monte Casino, who wrote his essay, *Direttorio et arte per intendere le pubbliche scritture,* in 1647, "certamente uno dei primi, se non il primo addirittura, trattato di archivistica e diplomatica. Quel' opera rimase però inedita."

On Archives

[*Introduction*]

Cardinal Cleselius once said to me, when I met him as he was returning to Germany, that he was a sort of living archives of the Austrian House, because he had served four emperors of that family in the course of nearly sixty years. But you, best and wisest of senators,[19] who have not only read through the annals of our fathers and all the secret records of this most favored state, but have committed them to faithful memory, we will, with much greater truth, call the living archives of Venice. And since there is hardly a book that you have not opened, searched through, and evaluated with keen judgment, so as to garner therefrom everything unusual, we will (with greater accuracy than was done in the case of Cassius Longinus[20]) call you an animate library and a walking abode of the muses. Although, therefore, we can cull nothing from ancient or modern authors which you have not, yourself, already excerpted, still, because of your wondrous incitement of industry on the part of others, you bid me put into writing whatever has come to my attention, as I read, on the subject of archives. And I, who am far removed from such studies, and have almost no previous acquaintance with antiquity, although I am able to write nothing worthy of your erudition, prefer to seem to all untutored rather than ungracious to you.

Chapter I. *What is an archives?*

The later Greeks used the word *archeion*[21]; the later Latin writers, following the same idea and using almost the same letters, used *archivum*. But the more ancient Greeks preferred the terms *grammatophylakion* and *chartophylakion*; the more ancient Romans, *tabularium* and *tablinum*.[22] But that *camera* was also equivalent to *archivum* is clear from the rescript of Innocent III in which he says, "We have not suspected the census book although it is not found in our *camera* but in that of Cardinal S. Adrian, who, when he was

[19] See note 16. Bonifacio's remarks, fulsome as they are, seem to substantiate the reputation of Molino. Other persons mentioned in this essay have not been honored with a note. Direct references have, whenever possible, been identified.

[20] Eunapius, *Lives of the Sophists:* Cassius Longinus, p. 7 (ed. Boissevain).

[21] The original gives these words in Greek characters.

[22] See Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-encyclopädie,* s.v. "Archive."

camerarius took it from the camera of St. Peter."[23] An *archivum*, however, according to the definition of Servius Maurius,[24] is "a place in which public records are preserved"; or, according to the glossaries of the jurisconsults,[25] a public repository of records and documents; or, finally, as Ulpian decided,[26] "a public place in which instruments are deposited."

When the works of learned men were assembled in one place, the Greeks called that an *atheneion*, the Romans called it a *pluteum*; e.g., Juvenal:[27]

Et iubet archetypos pluteum servare Cleanthas

To the ancient Egyptians *mouseion* meant the same as *prytaneion* to the Athenians; that is, "a table to which all whom scholarship had made famous in all of Egypt had free access," as Philostratus states,[28] but usage, "with which rests the judgment on speech," as the Venusian says,[29] prefers to designate the depository of books and volumes, as if an inner shrine consecrated to the muses, a museum.

Chapter II. *When were archives instituted?*

There are those who think that the institution of archives is not far removed from the time of our great-grandparents, and that, therefore, throughout all the states of Italy, some five hundred years or more ago, those places where public records are kept were constructed. There is no difficulty in pointing out the lack of knowledge of these persons, and in refuting their ignorance. The Holy Roman Pontiff Deusdedit one thousand years ago wrote to Gordian, bishop of Seville, that he had found the records of the Ephesians in the archives of the Apostolic See.[30] The emperor Justinian eleven hundred years ago decreed that a document which is taken from a public archives bears witness as a public document.[31] St. Jerome wrote to Paula and Eustochius twelve hundred years ago that he had trans-

[23] "C. ad audientiam de praescriptionibus." Unverified.
[24] *Commentary on Virgil*, Geo., 2.502.
[25] Cf. *Corpus glossariorum latinorum*, V.168.6.
[26] *Dig.*, 48.19.9.6. Bonifacio's legal references are not easily identified; e.g., this appears in his work as "l. moris ff. de poenis."
[27] Juvenal, 2.7.
[28] *Lives of the Sophists*, 524.
[29] Horace, *Art of Poetry*, 2.71,72.
[30] "C. pervenit 30.q.1."; quoted in Baronius, *Annales ecclesiastici*, A.D. 617, Chap. I.
[31] "De iis qui ingred." Unverified.

lated "the Book of Esther, rescued from the archives of the Hebrews, more expressly, word for word."[32]

In the synod of Mileum it was decreed,[33] about the year 400, that the register and the archives (*archivus*) of Numidia should be in the metropolis of Constantine. However, *archivus*, as Caesar Baronius interprets it,[34] is the same as *archivum*; to wit, a place where public documents are kept for perpetual record. Ulpian, in the time of the emperor Alexander, fourteen hundred years ago, learnedly named and defined *archivum* and *grammatophylacium* as we have already said.[35] From the testimony of these writers it can be seen that the practice of establishing public archives is quite old.

But Tertullian, more ancient than all of these, in proof of the census of the whole world taken by Augustus, offers the records of the census from the Roman archives in which were kept the records of each census.[36] And finally Flavius Josephus, who flourished under Vespasian, nearly sixteen hundred years before our day, testifies that those in uprising set fire to the archives which was at Jerusalem so that, after all records of debts were burned, the whole faction of debtors who were clamoring for a release from debt would ally themselves to them.[37] To us, therefore, the first institution of archives seems not only old and ancient, but even to go back to the origin of the world. Indeed, the same Flavius Josephus writes[38] that the sons of Seth, the grandsons of Noah, built twin towers, the one of brick, the other of marble, raising the one against conflagrations, the other against floods. In these were collected whatever they found worthy of record, since from Adam they had learned that the world would be twice destroyed: it would first be drowned in water, and later it would be consumed by fire. And so I believe that these towers were nothing else than archives.

Chapter III. *On the archives of the ancients.*

The records for eight thousand years are preserved in the archives of the Egyptian city of Sais according to the testimony of a priest of

[32] Migne, *Patrologia latina*, 28.1433A.
[33] "Conc. Afr., c.53"; quoted in Baronius, *op. cit.*, A.D. 402, Chap. LXV.
[34] Baronius, A.D. 402, Chap. LXV.
[35] See note 26.
[36] "Lib. de carne Christi"; incorrect reference, which, perhaps, should be to *Five Books in reply to Marcion*, Bk. V.
[37] *Jewish War*, 2.17.6.
[38] *Jewish Antiquities*, 1.2.70,71.

that nation as given in Plato.[39] But Herodotus[40] bears witness that there were records for seventeen thousand years among these same people. These are marvelous and incredible statements to us who number only six thousand years from the founding of the world according to the chronology of the Hebrews. But far more portentous things are told by the Egyptians, for they say, according to Laertius,[41] that from the time of Vulcan, the son of the Nile, to Alexander the Great forty thousand years and more had passed, in which time they contend that the sun was eclipsed three hundred and sixty-three times, and the moon eight hundred and thirty-two times. They say besides, on the word of Mela,[42] that they had three hundred thirty kings down to Amasis, and that under them, as appeared from their records, thirteen thousand stars had fallen, and all the stars had absolutely completed their motion four times, and the sun had twice risen in contrary course from the west. The Chaldeans, even more impudent falsifiers, boasted that they had observations of the constellations dating back from three and four hundred thousand years up to the time of Alexander of Macedon, as Diodorus tells us.[43] Cicero[44] adds that the Chaldeans profess that they can produce records from public places embracing the events of four hundred seventy thousand years.

Chapter IV. *On the archives of the Greeks and the Romans.*

The Lacedaemonians most diligently preserved in public trust the records of leagues and treaties at Amyclae, according to Alexander of Alexandria.[45] But I find elsewhere that the custody of public instruments was in the Areopagus and in the temple of Minerva. The Romans also had both their treasury and their archives in the temple of Saturn; their wills and their codicils, their notes and receipts they deposited in the shrine of Apollo Capitolinus or entrusted to the good faith of the Vestal Virgins. This is on the testimony of Suetonius and many others.[46]

Almost all nations had libraries, which can properly be called

[39] *Timaeus*, 22.
[40] *Histories*, 2.43.
[41] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of eminent philosophers*, 1.2; the number is given as 48,863.
[42] Pomponius Mela, 1.59, says that 13,000 ages are recorded.
[43] Diodorus Siculus, *Library of history*, 2.3.9, gives the number as 473,000.
[44] *On divination*, 1.19.37; there is no mention of "public places."
[45] Alexander ab Alexandro, *Genialium dierum libri sex . . .*, 5.3.
[46] See appropriate references in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-encyclopädie*.

archives of books, for a gloss[47] called archives *armaria codicum*. The most memorable and distinguished before all others was the Hebrew library which was in the temple where the oracles of the prophets, the acts of the judges, and the deeds of the kings were preserved. That this library was very ancient is confirmed by the authority of Scripture.[48] The Babylonian and Persian archives are likewise mentioned in Holy Scripture.[49] Then comes the fame of the library of the Greeks which Pisistratus first established at Athens, Xerxes carried off to Persia, and Seleucus caused to be returned to Athens.[50] Ptolemy Philadelphus built the Alexandrian library and, according to Aulus Gellius,[51] filled it with seven hundred thousand volumes. Publius Victor[52] said that there had been twenty-nine public libraries in Rome, among which the outstanding ones were the Julian created by Julius Caesar, the Palatine by Augustus, the Ulpian by Trajan, the Domitian and Gordian by those Roman emperors from whose names they were known. But today among the libraries of Rome, in fact, among all those of the whole world, by far the most distinguished and eminent is that of the Vatican built in the memory of our fathers by Sixtus V in connection with the basilica of the Prince of the Apostles.

Chapter V. *On the archives of the barbarians.*

We have learned that numbers sometimes took the place of letters to such an extent among barbarians that they wove together the history not only of domestic but even of public events by numbers. In Peru, as we read in Oviedo and Pharanusinus,[53] there are extant in each of the large cities archives of some size. The attendants in these, who are very skilled in this matter, make up little ropes, which they call *quippi*, of colors varied according to the matters which they signify, and tie them in multiformed knots. Finally, they place them in different locations according to difference in time, and from them they can tell learnedly and quickly any event, in any place, that was worth recording.

But the Chinese, whom some call the Sini, not only do not lack letters, but even use more than six thousand characters (instead of

[47] Cf. *Corpus glossariorum latinorum*, IV.20.51, V.168.5.
[48] E.g., II Maccabees, 2:13.
[49] E.g., I Ezra, 5:17 and 6:1; Esther, 10:2.
[50] Aulus Gellius, *Attic nights*, 7.17.1,2.
[51] *Ibid.*, 7.17.3.
[52] Unidentified.
[53] "Hist. ind. occid. epist. nuncup. ad Fra Castorium navig. vol. 3." Unidentified.

the twenty-two letters of the Greeks), and by a single one of these make not only one letter or syllable but a whole word, and often, a complete remark. This Juan Gonzalez de Mendoza wrote in his history of this region.[54] The use of printing is said to be much more ancient among the Chinese than among us. Although this art is thought to have been invented in our part of Europe in the year of salvation 1458, by John Gutenberg of Mainz, yet volumes skilfully printed from type by the Chinese eight hundred years earlier are extant.[55] On that account such very old records are found in their archives that it is established from their histories that from Vitey to this age two hundred and fifty kings held sway over their affairs for four thousand three hundred years.[56] Let there be trust in the words of Mendoza only if he is free from error or falsehood.[57] We do not easily know nor rashly refute the things which are said by the Spanish writers about the nations living on opposite sides of the earth from us.

Chapter VI. *On the archives of our own people.*

That the institution of archives is not as new as some have wrongly thought, in addition to what we have said above, is clear from the repeated attestation of St. Jerome.[58] That greatest interpreter of Holy Scripture wrote that the archives of the Romans, in which oecumenical councils and all the rest of the secret files of religion were kept, was so famous in his day that from all parts of the Christian world recourse was had to it for the solution of dubious points. In the Roman synod, also, a little after the death of Jerome, under Pope Gelasius frequent mention is made of the archives and record boxes at Rome, of the librarians, the scribes, and the keepers of the boxes.[59] That in a number of other cities in Italy there were also very old archives is apparent from the antiquity of the places themselves and of the records which are found there. To pass over the rest in silence, in our canonical archives in the very old church of this city of Treviso[60] we have an autograph, made six hundred years ago, in which is related the embassy of our departed canons to the Supreme

[54] *Historia de las cosas . . .*, 3.13.

[55] *Ibid.*, 3.16, says five hundred years.

[56] *Ibid.*, 3.1, deals with Vitey and his direct line.

[57] Bonifacio's critical statement is embellished with a pun: *Mend*oza . . . *mend*o (error) . . . *mend*acio (falsehood).

[58] "Epist. 52 ad Pammachius." Incorrect reference; unidentified.

[59] Unidentified.

[60] Since Bonifacio does not use *hic, is, ille* in the sense of "the," it is clear that he wrote this essay at the seat of his archdeaconate.

Pontiff for obtaining confirmation of the bishop whom these same canons had elected.

It has been shown by Nature that concern for the future—and this was once a trite proverb in the language of the Greeks[61]—is better than concern for the past. You, great senator, the custodian of letters, the Maecenas of men of letters, the reviver of antiquity, the most painstaking restorer of a record that is slipping away, have recently instituted a library and archives in the academy at Padua. In it you have assembled many volumes, printed and manuscript alike. You have endowed it with revenues and incomes. Your own books, most distinguished in the fame of their authors, most select in their erudition, most accurate typographically, most recent in time, most handsome in ornament, richest in notes, additions, and scholia, most charming in variety of argument and subject, and—I might almost say—infinite in number, you are planning to leave to the same institution.

Chapter VII. *On the usefulness of archives.*

Those princes who do not realize the usefulness of archives and libraries are really followers of the worst precedent in their misguided emulation of the Caligulas and the Jovinians, the horrible examples and disgraces of the Roman empire, by whose detestable sacrilege many libraries are said to have been despoiled of all the finest writers, and then torn down and burned. Nothing is so sacred that the mad licentiousness and unchecked boldness of tyrants does not profane it. But those who stored away in places sacred to memory the books and records from which a late posterity, itself ignorant of past events, might draw, as from a storehouse, information for its own erudition and that of its successors, they imitate the Alexanders the Great, the Julius Caesars, the Octavian Augustuses, and the great Constantines to whose generous magnificence we acknowledge receipt of whatever is left to us of a truncated and almost effaced antiquity. If we had been completely deprived of these precious crumbs, we should all be compelled to grope in the dark, to feel our way with our hands not only in history but also in the other disciplines.

There is nothing more useful for instructing and teaching men, nothing more necessary for clearing up and illustrating obscure mat-

[61] Unidentified; apparently not in such collections as Erasmus' *Adages*, or A. Schott, *Adagia sive proverbia graecorum* . . . (Antwerp, 1612).

ters, nothing more necessary for conserving patrimonies and thrones, all things public and private, than a well constituted store of volumes and documents and records—as much better than navy yards, as much more efficacious than munition factories, as it is finer to win by reason rather than by violence, by right rather than by wrong. And we will not attain a knowledge of antiquity except through archives and libraries. Who at this time could present to us the traditions of the Jews, the secret arts of the cabalists, and the prodigious record of Esdras in such a way that, without literature, we could inquire into the deeds of a past age and the affairs of our ancestors.

Chapter VIII. *On the administrators of archives.*

It would be in vain to store writings in any place whatsoever if the care and diligence of man did not ward off the injuries of time. The same insects, the same decay, the same blight, the same mice little by little would corrupt and eat them out when piled up in a repository no less than if neglected and scattered in various places. Therefore, in accordance with the best of advice, skilled and painstaking men were put in charge of libraries and archives, and by public funds, through the generosity of princes, were induced to enter upon a careful undertaking of the task enjoined. These men used to be called archivists (*archivista*), or librarians (*bibliothecarius*), or custodians (*custos*), or guardians of the writings (*grammatophylax*), or keepers of the chests (*scrinarius*). A chest (*scrinium*), we may say in passing, is properly not a place for coins, but for books and writings, for we read in Catullus[62] of the chests of the bookdealers, and of chests of letters in Pliny the Elder,[63] and Horace[64] calls for his pen and paper and book chests at sunrise.

The attendants of archives were also known by other names. Our ancestors called them chamberlains (*camerarius*), keepers of the papers (*chartularius*), guardians of the papers (*chartophylax*), and finally ediles (*aediles*) for so Pomponius wrote: "To be in charge of the buildings in which the people deposited all their known affairs they constituted two, and called them ediles."[65] A gloss testifies that these are today called *massario* and *camerlingo*. But those who receive the public acts and communicate copies of them upon request we

[62] Catullus, 14.18.
[63] *Natural history*, 7.94.
[64] *Epistles*, 2.1.114,115.
[65] *Dig.*, 1.2.2.21.

call notaries (*notarius, tabellio*), amanuenses (*amanuensis*), scribes (*scriba*), shorthand writers (*excerptor*), registrars (*commentariensis*), copyists (*exscriptor*), and notary clerks (*libellio*). Indeed, care over the archives was given only to great and learned men.

We read that M. Terentius Varro, judged by the very learned to be the most learned of the Romans, was put in charge of the Palatine library by Gaius Julius Caesar.[66] Demetrius of Phaleron and Zenodotus of Ephesus were put in charge of the Alexandrian library by Ptolemy Philadelphus. Gaius Melissus the Umbrian undertook the care of the Augustan library in the portico of Octavia. Albinus Flaccus [i.e., Alcuin], the preceptor of the Emperor Charlemagne, was in charge of the library of York in England; Marcus Antonius Sabellicus presided over the library of St. Mark in Venice; Platina and Baronius undertook the administration of the Vatican library. The high degree of dignity and wisdom found in each of these men is shown by the works which they published, and is attested by the honors they bore.

Chapter IX. *On preserving order in archives.*

To dispose in perfect order is a quality of God alone, and order itself is something divine. When all things were disordered and confused, not only inharmonious and without proper relation to each other, but even violently at odds with each other, God brought order to confusion. Immediately thereafter the beautiful face of the earth shown forth, the lovely face of the heavens sparkled, the wondrous harmony of the universe took form. Through order, therefore, He gave form to formless things. Deservedly is order called the soul of the world by the Academicians. We would rightly say that the soul of archives, too, is nothing else than order. Bricks, beams, and tiles, as we learn from a famous statement of Xenophon,[67] set up to no purpose, and scattered without order, are unpleasant to look at, useless to employ, yet, fitted into their proper places, they rise up into very beautiful and magnificent buildings. So indeed, writings of all sorts, if you have them confused and badly mixed, are of no use. On the other hand, if you dispose them properly in boxes, in addition to the fact that they will be less exposed to dust and worms, you will have each of them conveniently and easily at hand without labor of searching.

[66] Suetonius, *Lives of the twelve Caesars:* Julius, 44.
[67] *Memorabilia,* 3.1.7. The reference cited "Bk. 2."

That order is certainly to be kept in archives is demonstrated to everyone by Nature herself: first it is proper to divide up locations, then affairs, and finally times. If we aid this division by means of indexes arranged alphabetically, nothing will be difficult for us find. First then, for example, let us separate what pertains to the city of cities, Venice, then what pertains to Padua, then to Verona. After that let us divide up the individual items of business of the individual cities, so that in one place we may dispose the wills, in another the matters of trade, in another the contracts. Then, starting from the most ancient times, let us proceed through the sequence of years and months to the most recent dates. Then let us prepare indices and syllabi, let us make up lists and catalogues in alphabetical order. Adapting to each set of materials its own indices, whatsoever will be needed we will have before our eyes immediately, without bother, so that it will seem rather to have rushed into our hands by design, than to have fallen there by chance.

Chapter X. *On the inviolability of archives.*

The very sanctity of the place demonstrates the inviolability of archives, for they used to be in temples, as we have already said. Nor have archives ceased to be inviolate even though today they are not in temples. Rightly, says Ulpian,[68] do we call inviolate those things which are neither sacred nor profane, but confirmed with a certain inviolability. What is supported by a certain sanctity, that is inviolate even though it be not consecrated to God. Marcianus[69] also says that that is inviolate which is protected and fortified against injury by man. A consecrated spot can be located even in a private building. Therefore, even now it is permissible to call archives inviolate, especially since they have acquired public authority and the protection of the prince under whose patronage public places now are, with the result that violators of archives are charged not only with sacrilege but also with treason, and, according to the constitutions of the Roman Pontiffs, are struck down with anathema. However, archives are violated by forgers who corrupt the integrity of public instruments, by pilferers who steal or purloin the documents which have been deposited, by incendiaries who set fire to and try to burn the places in which the acts of states ought to be kept.

So great is the respect for archives that credence is obviously to be

[68] *Dig.*, 11.7.2.
[69] *Ibid.*, 11.7.36.

given to instruments produced from a public archives, and they make, as the jurisconsults say, full faith. Thus did Johannes Andreius, Hostiensis, Panormitanus, Archidiaconus[70] and all other interpreters of canon law establish in the chapter *Cum causam,* "On Examinations"; in the chapter *Ad audientiam,* "On Prescriptions"; and also in the chapter *Pervenit,* 30, quaest. 1. In agreement with these are Bartholus, Baldus, Alexander, Jason, Castrensis and other interpreters of civil law everywhere in the Authentica *ad haec,* in the Codex, "On the Reliability of Instruments."[71]

And that no sin should be committed against the inviolability and sanctity of archives through the wrongs done by wicked men, and that whatever was left of public instruments should not perish through lack of care or from neglect, Justinian, the most foresighted of emperors, ordered archives to be constructed in separate cities of the Roman world. He wrote to John, prefect of the praetorians, in these words: "Let Your Eminence give orders throughout each and every province that a public building be allocated, in which building the magistrate (*defensor*) is to store the records, choosing someone to have custody over them so that they may remain uncorrupted and may be found quickly by those requiring them, and let there be among them an archives, and let that which has been neglected in the cities be corrected."[72] Thus spake the emperor. From his words it is clear, to mention this in passing, that the title of "Eminence" with which Octavus Urbanus, the Supreme Pontiff of the universal church, recently honored the cardinals, belonged at one time to the prefects of the praetorians whose station was so high that Eunapius[73] called it *aporphyron basileian;* that is, royal power without the purple.

Lester K. Born

Washington, D.C.

[70] Unidentified.

[71] Unidentified.

[72] "De defensorib. civ. et iudicare coll. 3." Unidentified; a similar idea is found in *Cod.,* 1.55.9.

[73] *Lives of the sophists.* Prohaeresius, p. 490 (ed. Didot).

THE PAPERS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

ON June 23, 1826, Thomas Jefferson noted in his "epistolary ledger" the receipt of a letter from V. W. Southall. On June 25 he closed the record of almost half a century's correspondence with a memorandum of letters written to George Stevenson and Bernard Peyton.[1] The letters received, endorsed with the writer's name and the date and place written, he filed with copies of their answers. On June 28, he made a last entry in his pocket account books, "pd. Isaacs for cheese 4.84."[2] And on July 4, 1826, he died, leaving behind in good condition the well ordered accumulation of correspondence and papers that has been called "the richest treasure house of information ever left by a single man."[3]

In bequeathing a watch to his favorite grandson, Thomas Jefferson Randolph, Jefferson further provided, ". . . My papers of business going of course to him as my executor, all others of a literary or other character I give to him as of his own property."[4] From this bequest, the large Jefferson collections at the Library of Congress (about 50,000 pieces), at the Massachusetts Historical Society (about 7000 pieces), and at the Missouri Historical Society (1100 pieces) were acquired. Fragments from the same bequest are scattered in smaller collections, public and private, from California to western Europe. Three other Jefferson collections, at the Virginia State Library (number of pieces undetermined), in the National Archives (number of pieces undetermined), and at the University of Virginia (1400 pieces) are derived wholly or in part from sources independent of the bequest and consist of Jefferson's papers as legislator and governor, as secretary of state, and as the "father" and first rector of the University of Virginia.

The Rare Book and Manuscript Division of the University of Virginia Library has attempted to trace all surviving letters to and from Jefferson in public repositories, in private custody, and in printed form, a project which has been in progress for upwards of ten years. At the present time this list is in the form of a chronological check

[1] Two index volumes in the Jefferson Papers, Library of Congress. Photostat, University of Virginia.

[2] Account Book, 1821-1826. See note 5.

[3] Gilbert Chinard, *Thomas Jefferson, the Apostle of Americanism* (Boston, 1929), xvi.

[4] Original holograph will, clerk's office, Albemarle County, Va. Photostat, University of Virginia.

list written on thousands of temporary slips. It embraces most of the large collections just mentioned, many scattered holdings, five of the collected editions of Jefferson's writings, and printed items in historical journals and other publications.

Like many other educated Virginia planters of his day, Jefferson wrote his own letters, saved copies of them, and preserved his entire correspondence. In this, and in the keeping of orderly daily accounts of cash receipts and expenditures[5] Jefferson merely followed a fairly usual custom; but his natural aptitude for organization and system and his insatiable intellectual curiosity led him to improve upon the customary form and to keep, in addition, many other valuable records. He kept, for example, a garden book,[6] a farm book,[7] and three separate records of meteorological observations.[8] But it was in the amassing of a vast correspondence with writers in every walk of life throughout the United States, England, and the Continent, covering every type of subject from mammoth skeletons to the Napoleonic wars, that Jefferson left his most valuable bequest to posterity. In fact, when his friend Robert Walsh of Philadelphia asked him in 1823 to furnish materials for writing his biography, he declined graciously, on the plea that "the letters of a person, especially one

[5] The dispersal of Jefferson's papers is well illustrated by the following table showing the present location of the Account Books. Photostatic sets of the entire group are now at the University of Virginia and at the Library of Congress.

1767–1770	LC–Kean
1771	MHS
1772	MHS
1773	LC
1774	MHS
1775	Huntington
1776–1778	MHS
1779–1782	LC
1779–1782–Index	UVa
1783–1790	MHS
1791–1803	NYP
1804–1808	NYHS
1809–1820	NYHS
1821–1826	NYHS
	MHS (14 miscellaneous pages, various dates between 1799 and 1816, with an index.)

[6] Garden Book [1766-1824]. Original, Massachusetts Historical Society. Photostat, University of Virginia.

[7] Farm Book [1774-1822]. Original, Massachusetts Historical Society. Photostat, University of Virginia.

[8] Weather Observations. 3 MSS vols. 1776-1820, 1785-1786, 1802-1816. Originals, Massachusetts Historical Society. Photostats, University of Virginia. See also the article by Fred. L. Francis and Fred. J. Randolph in *Monthly Weather Review* (U.S. Dept. of Ag., 1895), pp. 456-458. U.S. Weather Bureau *Bulletin*, No. 11.

whose business has been chiefly transacted by letters, form the only full and genuine journal of his life, and few can let them go out of their hands while they live. A life written after these hoards become opened to investigation must supercede any previous one. . . ."[9] This vast hoard was first opened by his grandson, Thomas Jefferson Randolph, who published a *Memoir, Correspondence, and Miscellanies, from the Papers of Thomas Jefferson* (4 vols., Charlottesville, 1829). Until this time, the papers had remained more or less undisturbed as Jefferson had left them; but in 1832, George Tucker undertook to write a life of Jefferson, chiefly to answer Henry Lee's *Observations on the Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (New York, 1832). He made use of an unpublished selection of the letters made by Nicholas P. Trist, who had married Virginia Jefferson Randolph, daughter of Martha Jefferson and Thomas Mann Randolph.[10] This suggests a first possible division of the correspondence. Before this, in 1815 ,when the Library of Congress purchased Jefferson's library, and again at their purchases from the auction of his second library in 1829, they had acquired some manuscripts. In addition to the unpublished selection, Tucker was able to recover from John Page, Jr., a series of letters to Jefferson's lifelong friend, John Page of Rosewell, written before 1770. In February, 1770, when the family plantation Shadwell burned, Jefferson had written Page that he had lost every paper he had in the world, and almost every book.[11] The Page letters, therefore, are among the few early letters that have survived. Any other letters antedating 1770 may be expected to have survived among the papers of their recipients.

The collection of public papers was offered to Congress in 1848, and on August 12 of that year, an act was passed authorizing their purchase for $20,000 from Thomas Jefferson Randolph and their deposit in the State Department for a separation of public and private papers. Then began a leisurely process of selection in the State Department as the private papers were culled, probably by Henry A. Washington, the librarian of the State Department, who in 1853-1854 edited the somewhat inadequate Congressional edition of the writings.[12]

[9] Thomas Jefferson, Monticello, April 5, 1823, to Robert Walsh, Philadelphia. Original, University of Virginia.

[10] George Tucker, *The Life of Thomas Jefferson* (2 vols., London, 1837), I, xv.

[11] Andrew A. Lipscomb and Albert Ellery Bergh, eds., *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (20 vols., Washington, 1903), IV, 18. Hereafter cited as Lipscomb and Bergh.

[12] Henry A. Washington, ed., *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* . . . (10 vols., New York and Washington, 1853).

Early in 1851, Henry S. Randall began work on his life of Jefferson, visiting the descendants of Edgehill and interviewing old neighbors for personal recollections of the sage of Monticello. At the Randolph home, Edgehill, was found a large collection of papers and accounts of Peter Jefferson, Jefferson's father, dealing chiefly with the administration of the estate. These are now in the Henry E. Huntington Library in California.[13]

By about 1870, the Randolph collection of papers had finally been scrutinized by a joint committee of the Library of Congress and the Department of State, and the private papers not purchased were returned to the family. The subsequent career of the residuum can be traced only in part. The selection of public papers had been neither thorough nor consistent: papers of public interest had been returned and some private ones retained. Part of the collection retained by Congress[14] was then "arranged and bound in a manner defying every rule governing due historical treatment."[15] Moreover, after this had been done, and twenty-six years after the private papers had been returned to Thomas Jefferson Randolph, A. R. Spofford, then Librarian of Congress, found a large parcel, evidently selected as public papers by the committee, which had been overlooked. These were bound in nineteen additional volumes.[16] Nor was the entire collection yet together, for the Department of State turned over to the Library of Congress additional letters in 1905, and in 1906 or 1907 a box containing more than 2000 additional pieces was found in Mr. Spofford's office. The transfer of this box finally brought the government's holdings from the Randolph heirs together under one roof and one direction.[17]

In the meantime, the private papers were being subjected to that scattering of manuscripts among a "multitude of inheritors," as Randall feared in 1851.[18] They were used, while still together, by Sarah Nicholas Randolph, daughter of Thomas Jefferson Randolph,

[13] Henry S. Randall, *The Life of Thomas Jefferson* (3 vols., New York, 1858), I, 16n.

[14] *Calendar of the Correspondence of Thomas Jefferson.* Part I, *Letters from Jefferson.* Part II, *Letters to Jefferson.* Part III, Supplementary. *Bulletin of the Bureau of Rolls and Library of Department of State,* Nos. 6, 8, 10. (Washington, Dept. of State, 1894-1903). Hereafter cited as *Bur. of Rolls.*

[15] Worthington C. Ford in "The Jefferson Papers," preface to Fiske Kimball, *Thomas Jefferson, Architect* (Boston, privately printed, 1916), 6. For Ford's later comments, see his introductory note to the Bixby collection: *Thomas Jefferson Correspondence . . .* (Boston, 1916).

[16] *Bur. of Rolls,* No. 10 (1903), iii.

[17] Ford, *op. cit.,* 7.

[18] Randall, *op. cit.,* I, viii.

to write her charming *Domestic Life of Thomas Jefferson* (New York, 1871). In 1889, she offered the papers to the United States, and a bill, H.R. 1305, was referred to the committee on the library. Sarah Randolph died in 1898, leaving the papers to her sisters, Carolina Ramsay Randolph and Cary Ann Nicholas Randolph. In 1892, the committee reported on the bill, describing a portion of the collection in detail, as containing 3060 pieces bound in 21 portfolios, none of them duplicated in the Department of State collections. The committee urged the purchase of the collection for its historical as well as its biographical value, but the bill failed to pass, and the chance to reassemble Jefferson's correspondence in one place was lost.[19]

Thomas Jefferson Coolidge of Boston, a great-grandson of Jefferson, purchased a collection of about 7000 pieces from these private papers in 1898, which he presented to the Massachusetts Historical Society in June of that year. A selection of these was printed in 1900 in the society's proceedings.

From Mrs. Wilson Cary Nicholas Randolph in 1907, the Library of Congress received 178 drafts of Jefferson's letters on the University of Virginia, and some years earlier Wilson Cary Nicholas Randolph had presented to the University of Virginia 62 of Jefferson's sketches and plans of its original buildings.[20]

In 1912, William K. Bixby acquired a collection of about 2500 pieces from Mr. George P. Coleman of Williamsburg and Richmond. Mr. Coleman's ancestor, St. George Tucker, "the American Blackstone," was a close friend of Jefferson. Mr. Coleman's mother had married Henry A. Washington, and after his death, Dr. Charles Washington Coleman. It seems probable that part of the Coleman collection had been in St. George Tucker's papers, and another portion in Mr. Washington's, in connection with his work on the Congressional edition of the writings. There is still a collection of about 200 pieces, chiefly letter-press copies and incoming letters owned by Mr. Coleman and deposited in the Department of Research and Records of Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., which he had generously permitted the University of Virginia to microfilm for reference purposes. Mr. Bixby distributed upwards of 500 pieces of his collection

[19] House Miscellaneous Reports. 55th Congress, 2nd Session. Nos. 17-245. Report to accompany H.R. 1305, Jan. 21, 1898.

[20] *Report of the Librarian of Congress*, 1907, 135. Memorandum by Wilson Cary Nicholas Randolph, April 2, 1898. University of Virginia.

among 46 individuals and institutions which he thought should own them, and 1100 he presented to the Missouri Historical Society. A selection of these was printed in Boston in 1916 with notes by Worthington C. Ford, *Thomas Jefferson Correspondence, Printed from the Originals in the Collection of William K. Bixby;* and the Missouri Historical Society has since printed another selection,[21] but the greater part of the Bixby group is still unpublished.

Collections of the private papers have continued to come into public repositories. Thomas Jefferson Coolidge, Jr., in 1911 visited Monticello and was inspired by the idea of reproducing in Manchester, Mass., his ancestor's famous dwelling. He found Jefferson's architectural drawings for Monticello owned by Mrs. William Mann Randolph (née Mary Walker Randolph, daughter of Thomas Jefferson Randolph, Jr.) and Miss Cornelia J. Taylor (daughter of Thomas Jefferson Randolph Taylor, who had married Martha Jefferson Randolph, daughter of Thomas Jefferson Randolph). These he acquired and presented to the Massachusetts Historical Society. He also sponsored their publication in Fiske Kimball's definitive work on *Thomas Jefferson, Architect.*[22]

The Library of Congress added 121 "inedited letters" to its collection at a sale in Philadelphia, and has since acquired other Jefferson items as part of other collections, or as separate purchases or gifts.[23] These, with scattered holdings among the "multitude of inheritors," complete the record of the collection which Jefferson bequeathed to Thomas Jefferson Randolph in 1826.

It is interesting to note that in connection with the records of the commonwealth of Virginia, Jefferson evinced that interest in the preservation of historical documents that characterized his entire adult life. While he was still a law student at the College of William and Mary in 1762, and the records of the colony were kept in the Public Record Office in the capital at Williamsburg, he took a keen interest in the frail and crumbling records of the colony's earliest laws and made extensive transcriptions from them.[24] Beyond this, he collected as many of the printed and manuscript laws of the colony

[21] "Correspondence of Thomas Jefferson, 1788-1826," Missouri Historical Society, *Glimpses of the Past,* III, Nos. 4-6 (April-June, 1936), 77-133. Also separately reprinted.

[22] *Op. cit.*

[23] *Report of the Librarian of Congress,* 1912, 38. See also the later reports.

[24] Thomas Jefferson, Philadelphia, May 9, 1798, to Hon. St. George Tucker, Williamsburg. Jefferson Papers, Lib. of Cong.

as possible, and of these he wrote Judge George Wythe from Monticello on Jan. 16, 1796:

> . . . These I preserve by wrapping and sewing them up in oiled cloth, so that neither air nor moisture can have access to them. Very early in the course of my researches into the laws of Virginia, I observed that many of them were already lost, and many more on the point of being lost, as existing in only single copies in the hands of careful or curious individuals, on whose deaths they would probably be used for waste paper. I set myself therefore to work, to collect all which were then existing, in order that when the day would come in which the public should avert to the magnitude of their loss in these precious monuments of our property, and our history, a part of their regret might be spared by information that a portion had been saved from the wreck, which is worthy of their attention and preservation. In searching after these remains, I spared neither time nor expense; and am of the opinion that scarcely any law escaped me, which was in being as late as the year 1790 in the middle or southern parts of the State. In the northern parts, perhaps something might still be found. In the clerk's offices in the ancient counties, some of these manuscript copies of the laws may possibly still exist, which used to be furnished at the public expense to every county, before the use of the press was introduced. . . .

This collecting saved for Virginia its earliest laws, because after the removal of the capital to Richmond in December, 1779, the state's records were also transported, and there many were destroyed or seized by the British in 1781. Jefferson placed his collection at the disposal of William Waller Hening, who was compiling the *Statutes at Large,* and in doing so realized an ambition to insure its preservation "from the worm, from the natural decay of the paper, from the accidents of fire, or those of removal when it is necessary for any public purposes . . . [from] ravages of fire and ferocious enemies."[25] In his advice to Hening on the publication he advocated another sound principal of preservation, "I shall have no doubt of the exactness of your part of the work, but hope you will take measures to have the typography and paper worthy of the work"—advice which Hening was unfortunately not able to follow.[26]

Nor did his efforts to recover the state's official archives end there. On May 8, 1791, he wrote the president of the United States that

[25] Thomas Jefferson, Monticello, Jan. 16, 1796, to Judge George Wythe, in Lipscomb and Bergh, IX, 319-323. [Incorrectly dated by Hening as Jan. 16, 1795.] The letter was first printed in broadside form in 1796. See Evans, 30637.

[26] Thomas Jefferson, Washington, Jan. 14, 1807, to William Waller Hening, in *The Statutes at Large; Being a Collection of all the Laws of Virginia* . . . , edited by William Waller Hening (Richmond, 1809-1823), vii-viii.

he was attempting to restore the records destroyed by the British, particularly the transactions of the Revolution between June 1, 1779, and June 1, 1781. He asked to be allowed to borrow official letters he had addressed to Washington of those dates.[27] Two years later he was still engaged in this task, and wrote to Major General Horatio Gates from Philadelphia on March 12, 1793, "I am endeavoring to recover copies of my letters from the hands to whom they were addressed, and have been happy to find this more practicable than I had apprehended. . . . The whole shall be sacredly returned."[28]

The first two pages of Jefferson's epistolary ledger are quite apparently a record of official letters during his governorship which he recovered in this manner. With the records which survived the British raid, and a copy of the Executive Letter Book from July 27-September 8, 1780 (captured by the British and later deposited in the British Museum), the Virginia State Library in 1928 was able to bring out a fairly complete record of the official letters, under the editorship of H. R. McIlwaine.[29] Jefferson's drafts of bills and resolutions presented to the Virginia House of Delegates while he was a member of that body, have been rediscovered recently in the capitol and deposited in the archives of the new Virginia State Library building, where they are being catalogued under the direction of Dr. William J. Van Schreeven, the archivist.

The University of Virginia is the fortunate possessor of a collection of more than 1400 items, some of which accumulated as official university archives. Others were acquired by gift and purchase. The collection includes a large photostatic and microfilm collection acquired for research, such as the complete file of Jefferson's account books from 1767 to 1826 copied from many different sources, copies of unpublished letters in the Massachusetts Historical Society collections, and copies of scattered single letters still in private hands. A catalogued and indexed calendar of this collection has been prepared by the writer for publication in the near future.

The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, which owns Monticello, and is engaged in its restoration and maintenance as a national shrine, has received many gifts of Jefferson manuscripts, and has

[27] Thomas Jefferson, Philadelphia, May 8, 1791, to George Washington, in Lipscomb and Bergh, VIII, 194.

[28] Thomas Jefferson, Philadelphia, Mar. 12, 1793, to Major General Horatio Gates, in *Ibid.*, IX, 35-36.

[29] *Official Letters of the Governors of the State of Virginia.* Vol. II. *The Letters of Thomas Jefferson.* Edited by Henry R. McIlwaine (Richmond, 1928).

purchased others. All of these have been microfilmed for the library's collection, and are thus available for research. This collection includes, in addition to a few legal papers, a magnificent collection of music owned by Jefferson and his daughters and grandchildren at Monticello, presented by Miss Fanny Maury Burke, a descendant. There are some manuscript music books in the lot, which may or may not be original compositions by Jefferson, still others are copies by him, his daughters, and grandchildren of well chosen selections by leading eighteenth and nineteenth century composers. One music book contains Jefferson's directions for tuning the harpsichord.

In the University of Virginia's group of papers which could be classed as official are the original architectural drawings of the university already mentioned; a pocket memorandum book containing specifications; a few drawings and calculations used by Jefferson in directing the building operations; Minutes of the Board of Visitors of Central College (May 5, 1817-Feb. 26, 1819) and of the University of Virginia (to April 7, 1826) kept by Thomas Jefferson as rector; papers from the proctor's office dealing with financial affairs of the university and written or endorsed by Jefferson. An extensive correspondence with Jefferson's good friend and fellow sponsor of the university, Joseph Cabell, much of which pertains to the founding of the university, was presented by Mr. Robert C. Taylor.[30] Eighteen letters written by Jefferson to John Hartwell Cocke, a fellow member of the Board of Visitors, were presented by William Andrews Clark, Jr., an alumnus who collected and presented a number of other Jefferson manuscripts.

A collection of 434 manuscripts and 17 printed items in the McGregor Library consists of legal papers, surveyor's drawings, and correspondence relating chiefly to Jefferson's lands in Albemarle, Bedford, and Campbell counties, and a lawsuit over land at Milton, Virginia. A group of 35 items are of Jefferson's dealings, during his term as president, with George Barnes, a Georgetown merchant. Some important single items, particuuarly manuscript volumes or printed volumes with Jefferson's notations have also been acquired by the McGregor Library. Among materials of this type at the university library are the following:

[30] Many of these were printed with tactful omissions in Nathaniel Francis Cabell, *Early History of the University of Virginia as contained in letters of Thomas Jefferson and Joseph C. Cabell* . . . (Richmond, 1856).

Collection of Ordinances and Bills prepared by the Committee of the Convention for the Revision of the Laws of Virginia. 1776-1784. 205 pp., and index 4 pp. by Thomas Jefferson, with notes on the bills.

Copy of Jefferson's *Notes on the State of Virginia*, with his manuscript revisions, additions, maps and plates, which was used by J. W. Randolph to bring out a revised edition in 1853.

The copies of the New Testament from which Jefferson clipped, in the preparation of *The Philosophy of Jesus of Nazareth* . . .

Inscribed copy of the *Notes* which Jefferson had presented to Lafayette.

An Essay or Introductory Lecture towards Facilitating Instruction in the Anglo-Saxon and modern dialects of the English Language. For the use of the University. AD 64pp., and rough draft, AD 55 pp.

President Jefferson's Catalogue of Books for the University of Virginia Library. 1825. In the writing of Jefferson's granddaughter, Virginia Randolph. Signed by Jefferson as rector of the university.

Scrap book of political songs and poems compiled by Jefferson, chiefly of the period of his presidency and clipped from newspapers and periodicals.

Thomas Jefferson's designs for the President's House and Capitol in Washington. 1792. Four sheets with rough pencil drawings and two finished floor plans of the designs submitted anonymously by Jefferson in the competition announced by the Commissioners of the Federal Buildings (of which he was one).

Letters continue to accumulate at the university, both from the descendants who still retain fragments of the great mass of "private papers," and from descendants of those to whom the original letters were addressed. Just this year the McGregor Library obtained a collection of 509 items, chiefly intimate letters between members of the Carr, Cary, Randolph, Nicholas, and Jefferson families. In this group were 124 letters to and from Thomas Jefferson, including a series from Peter Carr concerning his education at William and Mary and his beginning law practice; Jefferson's correspondence with his brother Randolph of Snowden over family finances, agriculture, spinning jennies, and the latter's domestic difficulties (now ready for publication by the McGregor Library under the editorship of Professor Bernard Mayo); and letters of Wilson Miles Cary asking for advice in educating his grandchildren.

It is hoped that in the coming year the check list can be brought nearer to completion by the addition of records of letters to or from Jefferson in repositories having only small holdings. The epistolary ledger will then be transferred to this check list, and many letters now

undated, or to or from unknown correspondents can be assigned their proper designation. This list will be mimeographed or printed and circulated widely in the hope of locating as far as possible all Jefferson correspondence, whether original, polygraph or letter press copy, or printed. In this connection, the Missouri Historical Society has arranged through Miss Brenda Richard, its assistant archivist, to contribute a list in card form of its holdings; Dr. Earl G. Swem of the College of William and Mary has sent a list of his library's Jefferson collection to be recorded in the check list; the Maryland Historical Society has permitted photostating of its collection; and Dr. William Smith Mason has contributed photostats of the Jefferson material in the Franklin Papers at Yale University Library. This co-operative work of institutions and individuals is bringing order back to the confusion resulting from the wide scattering of the rich treasure house that was once a single collection. In anticipation of the Jefferson bi-centennial celebration in 1943, the University of Virginia hopes to contribute as an aid to Jefferson scholarship a printed calendar of its holdings, and an extensive checklist locating all possible Jefferson papers, and will welcome any lists which can be contributed.

One is reminded, in this task of Jefferson's own tireless labors on behalf of the preservation of the records of the state of Virginia and of the United States; and of his labor in amassing and organizing a vast correspondence, only to have it scattered by various mischances. The man who made use of copying presses and polygraph to preserve his correspondence, and who urged printing as another means of multiplying copies, would have welcomed microfilming. That he anticipated some of the soundest principles of modern archival practice is evidenced in his letter[31] to Ebenezer Hazard, which is dated Philadelphia, Feb. 18, 1791:

> Sir
>
> I return you the two volumes of records, with thanks for the opportunity of looking into them. They are curious monuments of the infancy of our country. I learn with great satisfaction that you are about committing to the press the valuable historical and state papers you have been so long collecting. Time & accident are committing daily havoc on the originals deposited in our public offices. The late war has done the work of centuries in this business. The lost cannot be recovered; but let us

[31] Thomas Jefferson, Philadelphia, Feb. 18, 1791, to Ebenezer Hazard. Original, Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Facsimile copy, University of Virginia.

save what remains; not by vaults and locks which fence them from the public eye and use in consigning them to the waste of time, but by such multiplication of copies as shall place them beyond the reach of accident. This being the tendency of your undertaking be assured there is no one who wishes it more complete success than Sir

Your most obedient & most humble sert
Th: Jefferson

Mr. Hazard.

University of Virginia

Helen Duprey Bullock

A TEN YEAR EXPERIMENT IN ARCHIVAL PRACTICES

IN offering this paper to archivists and curators of manuscript collections the writer has two purposes in view: first to record what was for its participants at least, a pioneering experience; and second to afford, if possible, some aid to those in a like situation.

When Duke University moved to its new campus in 1930, one of the many phases of expansion was the establishment of a manuscripts department in the university library. Chief sponsor was the late Dr. William Kenneth Boyd, at that time chairman of the history department and director of the library, who for thirty years had been collecting southern Americana, both printed and manuscript. The latter was chiefly a miscellaneous assortment obtained through soliciting students and friends for gifts of such letters and documents as their families possessed. During 1929 and 1930 Dr. Boyd had purchased several collections which included the following: Thomas Holley Chivers MSS, William Harris Crawford MSS, Paul Hamilton Hayne MSS, Henry Watson MSS, Clement Claiborne Clay MSS, and a number of important Confederate items. These six collections totalled almost seventeen thousand pieces and together with earlier accumulations brought the total body of material to something like twenty-five or thirty thousand items.

This is what confronted the two novices who undertook to bring rhyme and reason into the heterogeneous mass. Before proceeding further it may be well to define terms. "Collection" is used herein to refer to any body of manuscripts constituting a unit by reason of its centering about one person, one family, an institution, or a society. Collections are entered under the name of the person or chief person writing the letters. In some instances it is necessary to enter under the name of the person to whom letters are addressed, when no letters written by that person are present. In most collections, of course, there is a two-way correspondence. "Collection" is also used on occasion to refer to the entire manuscript holdings of an institution.

At the beginning there was little thought of any fundamental purpose or policy, but brief experience revealed two essentials: (1) to prepare material for use as rapidly as possible; and (2) to be able to find that material or specific items thereof when called for. Such a statement may sound elementary; accomplishment, however, was and always must remain a more complex matter.

With the physical equipment of the department installed, work began in January, 1931, upon the six collections above mentioned. During the previous summer the present writer had made a rather diligent but unsuccessful effort to learn at other institutions some principles of guidance in beginning the work. The other member of the department (Miss Lois Ferry, now Mrs. E. Taylor Parks of Berea, Kentucky) was more successful in a similar attempt. She had an opportunity to visit the Henry E. Huntington Library where members of the staff very kindly instructed her in their methods. On the basis of this information we began our work at Duke.

The first and unvarying essential is strict chronological arrangement within each collection. So essential is it that the inexperienced curator must get it firmly fixed in his thinking so that no amount of argument from those investigators who want material arranged by names of writers will swerve him from the chronological system.

The mechanics of chronological arrangement are easily managed; complications arise only in very large collections. The chief essentials are a large table and a store of patience. A further help is one or more clerical assistants who can soon be trained to do this largely mechanical work. At the risk of being too obvious, it may be added that the best procedure is to divide material first by decades, then by year, month, and day.

Following further Huntington library instructions, we proceeded to place each letter in a separate manila folder which was lettered on the outside in the following manner:

1862 [year] [brackets indicate information supplied]
July 14 [month, day]
Richmond, [Virginia] [place]

Davis, Jefferson to T[homas] J[onathan] Jackson
[writer: surname followed by full given names] [addressee: full names in normal order]
A.L.S. 2p. 4to.

It is at once clear that this was and would always be a time-consuming and expensive treatment. It was justified in these first six collections, all of which are decidedly valuable. Though curtailed in later years because of expense and space requirements, this method is still applied to our most important collections where valuable letters preponderate, since it affords greater ease in finding specific pieces and provides the best protection for material frequently in use.

Early in 1932, however, two collections were received which required different treatment. They were the papers of William Mahone, estimated at 100,000 pieces and the papers of Benjamin Newton Duke, estimated at 40,000 pieces. Here the problem was handling the mass with considerable speed rather than analysis of the individual piece. The policy of placing each letter in its own manila folder was, of course, abandoned. The fact that these were restricted deposits together with other considerations led to certain modifications in procedure.

During the year ending June 30, 1932, thirty other collections amounting to more than 15,000 items, had been acquired and the total holdings were estimated at 190,000 pieces. Among the most important accessions up to this time were letters of Alfred Cumming, Robert Edward Lee, William Nelson Pendleton, Francis Wilkinson Pickens, Philip Richard Fendall, James Iredell, and Nathaniel Greene.

During the following year (1932-1933) over 31,000 items were received, including papers of John Buchanan Floyd, Robert "Councillor" Carter, Appleton Oaksmith, James McDowell, and John Jordan Crittenden. The importance of most of these collections justified the most careful treatment, namely the placing of each letter in its own folder, duly identified on the outside.

By this time, however, there were other problems than the mere arranging and filing of collections. When there were only six large collections it was not difficult to locate them, but by 1933 the number of collections had risen to almost one hundred. In addition over eleven hundred manuscript volumes had been acquired. These included diaries, ledgers, account books, daybooks, sermons, lecture notes, and other varieties of records. Some of these were long runs of business records, particularly those of country merchants, while others were single items. In the press of other work all these volumes had been simply shelved without much examination and without listing. The impossibility of finding any given item soon became apparent, so that in 1932 it was necessary to list these volumes. A finding medium was established by numbering the shelves and giving each book a fixed location by shelf number. This medieval device may appear curious and naïve but it worked and is still in use for the particular and specially built shelves involved. Each shelf accommodates from two to twelve or fifteen volumes laid flat, depending on the size of the volumes. The cards made as a result of this listing were the beginning of the catalogue.

The listing, too, presented its own difficulties. The matter of terminology first had to be settled upon. With a little more experience it soon became clear that a few standardized terms would cover almost all kinds of material. The most commonly used are: ledger, account book, daybook, time book, plantation records, diary, letter book, and lecture notes. It was soon discovered that no trust could be placed in any titles or label that might be on the covers of such volumes, since the records inside might be something totally different. The question of authorship is often difficult if not insoluble. The individual's importance in his own eyes is painfully apparent when one discovers that a valuable financial record or a diary contains not the slightest hint of its recorder. In other cases the place of origin is equally elusive, and inclusive dates are not always easy to find. Identification must sometimes be based upon internal evidence alone, while in other cases some portion of the desired information cannot be found at all. The policy was adopted of making a card for each volume regardless of whether it was a part of a series or an isolated item. Material was entered under a personal name if possible; if not, under a firm name, society, or institution. When authorship cannot be established, entry is under title or type of record. The volumes themselves are then marked with white ink, giving author, title, and inclusive dates, and arranged on the shelves alphabetically by author. This applies to material placed on ordinary stack shelving; the fixed location shelves mentioned above soon were entirely inadequate and are now reserved for the most important volumes, such as diaries, letter books, and Civil War records of various kinds. No attempt has ever been made to assign classification numbers, since in the writer's opinion manuscript material does not lend itself to that kind of treatment, and since the arrangement adopted has provided a reasonably satisfactory finding medium. Could further time be devoted to these records, a more detailed study of their subject matter would be the most useful kind of information.

With the experience gained in listing bound material, the staff gained courage to attack the collections of loose papers which had already been arranged and filed, being laid flat in steel boxes. With the beginning of the new fiscal year (July, 1932), the director had asked for a count of pieces in each incoming collection, so that a more accurate record might be kept. Here began the keeping of an accession book listing acquisitions by name, inclusive of dates, place, and number of pieces. For purposes of counting, one piece was defined

as a single unit, whether that was a one-page letter, a ten-page sermon, or a huge ledger. The desire for more accurate records thus added itself to the pressing question of finding papers already filed. Both questions resolved themselves by taking an inventory during the autumn of 1933. This important work was carried to successful completion with the co-operation of Dr. Nelson M. Blake, now of the National Archives but at that time a member of the manuscripts department staff at Duke. Each box in which manuscript had been filed was examined, the papers in each collection were counted or closely estimated, inclusive dates were checked, and a card was made for each collection. This card gave the following information: entry by name, description as "letters," "letters and papers," or "papers," inclusive dates, place, and number of pieces. In this connection "papers" means material other than actual letters, such as bills, receipts, indentures, etc. It was then necessary to establish a finding medium. Each filing box has a label which shows the entry name, inclusive dates for letters contained in that box, and place. The boxes are housed in steel cabinets, each of which holds 114 boxes. To provide a finding medium each cabinet was arbitrarily numbered, and the cards made carried the cabinet number plus the number of boxes required to contain the collection in question. Thus fixed location again entered into the scheme of things. Some time later a visiting archivist advised assigning a number to each filing box as a finding index. This idea was not adopted for a number of reasons, chief among which were the requirements of our rapidly growing holdings. At any given time we might have filed a collection of 150 pieces. The next year we might acquire 5000 additional pieces belonging to this same collection. Incorporation of the new material would expand that collection from one filing box to perhaps twenty, thereby necessitating considerable shifting. With individually numbered boxes this would involve intolerable complications. In location by cabinet it is admittedly a disadvantage to have to look at each label on a possible 114 filing boxes before finding the desired box; this is offset, however, by the fact that these 114 boxes can be shifted any way within each cabinet, and that collections can be expanded as long as any empty boxes remain without changing the record on a single card, unless and until the boxes are moved to another cabinet. Location and finding media have been described in this great detail not because of the merits of the system adopted, but merely to show some of the problems involved in handling material so that it can be found

readily. The whole difficulty centers in the fact that locating a specific manuscript piece presents an entirely different problem from finding a specific book in a library stack. The adoption of a finding medium must necessarily depend to a great extent upon the filing equipment which is of such diverse sorts that a generalization could not be made.

One other problem confronted us during 1933. We had already acquired many small collections each of which contained only a few pieces. It was too wasteful of space to put each of these in a separate filing box. At first they were gathered together by state and placed in a filing box which was assigned to a cabinet containing large collections from that given state. This proved entirely unsatisfactory since the small filing box label would not contain all the names needed to show the contents of the box. After struggling for a year or more with this arrangement an entirely new system was inaugurated. All the small collections were gathered together and arranged alphabetically by entry name, disregarding geographic origin. They were placed in filing boxes and assigned to one particular cabinet. Henceforth this cabinet number on a card automatically indicated a small collection. This system worked, is still in use, and has greatly expanded. Its adoption also necessitated defining "collection," which after some experimentation came to mean two or more pieces which logically belong together. This absolute minimum was adopted because two pieces together are easier to find than two pieces separated.

Aside from these small collections the department had an allied problem in several hundred isolated letters which had no connection with any collection. Many of these were written by persons of some prominence and were practically impossible to locate. All such items were arranged chronologically, a card was made for each letter, and the whole was labelled "Miscellaneous File." This was a fairly satisfactory solution and is still in use, but this file has been kept as small as possible and is not now growing. It is checked through periodically, and letters which can be placed with recently acquired collections are transferred to them. In the opinion of the writer, "miscellaneous" is the pitfall of the unwary and inexperienced. It is easy to label a conglomerate packet of papers as miscellaneous and let it go at that. The more difficult and time-consuming, but proper thing to do, is to spread out the entire bundle, arrange it chronologically, and then examine all the pieces in turn for identical names, indications of family relationship, or other evidences of connection. Material should

never be filed under the term miscellaneous except in the case of single items totally unrelated to each other; in every other case some more logical form of entry can be found.

The entire holdings of the department were now (at the close of 1933) fairly well listed; loose papers by collection and bound records by volume. This was a vast improvement over no index whatsoever, yet this still left much to be desired. From the outset, the Paul Hamilton Hayne manuscripts had been our most used collection. Inquiries were frequently received asking the number of letters from various literary personages to be found in the Hayne collection. To answer such requests it was often necessary to turn through many hundreds of Hayne folders. Thus early in 1934 the need for a card index of individual letters in the Hayne and other important collections became too pressing for further postponement. At this juncture the federal government came to our aid. Beginning in the autumn of 1934, student help was available under the FERA. During that academic year over ten thousand cards were made indexing individual letters under the name of the writer. The typist worked from information provided on the manila folders previously mentioned. This work continued in succeeding years until all the letters which had been singly placed in the folders were thus indexed.

Meanwhile, lack of space had necessarily restricted this treatment of material to the most important accessions. There were, however, many other collections which contained important letters that should be indexed. This problem was solved by making handwritten cards during the process of reading through the collection. The typist then copied these cards. They were denominated "autograph cards," stamped "Autograph File," and placed in the card trays so as to form a dictionary catalogue of individual letters entered under the surname of the writer. The form adopted for these cards was as follows:

BRAGG, Braxton

To Jefferson Davis
1861. Oct. 30. Richmond, Va.
A.L.S.

Bragg Mss.

It will be observed that this card lists the collection to which the letter belongs, but not the location of the collection. This was necessitated by the frequent shifting of collections due to lack of space; hence it was inadvisable to show location on anything but the card listing the collection as a whole.

It was neither possible nor desirable to make a card for each letter of every collection since some collections contained comparatively little of value; therefore, another device was resorted to as a means of extending our knowledge of our holdings. This was the sketch. It has proved to be the most valuable part of our records. It arose from the realization that the knowledge gained from working through a collection was soon forgotten, whereas patrons asking for material usually described their wants by general subject rather than by specific item or collection. Something more than the mere memory of the staff was requisite and so in the autumn of 1934 the practice was adopted of writing a sketch for each collection worked and filed.

These sketches are designed to be an acceptable substitute for a detailed subject catalogue. The sketches contain, first, biographical information on the person or family represented in the collection, except for outstanding persons easily available in printed biographies or biographical dictionaries. In such cases only a bare outline is given. The sketch then notes any subjects of particular interest which the collection touches and concludes with some evaluation of the material as a source of historical, literary, economic, or social study. While such editorial comment is decried in some quarters, it has for our purposes a decided value since it gives investigators a concise idea of what they may expect to find in a given collection. In the writing of these sketches all available reference works are used and a reasonable amount of time expended in seeking biographical information. It is often necessary, however, to rely solely upon information gained from the letters themselves. For this purpose the letters in every collection are read in greater or less detail. Generally speaking, it is necessary to read about fifty per cent of a collection in order to have a working knowledge of its contents. Notes are made throughout the reading, recording such items as births, deaths, marriages, names of wife, husband, children, relationships between various members of a family, schools and colleges attended, public or other offices held, changes of residence, occupations, religious affiliations, and any other items of interest. From such notes an accurate sketch can be written even though references to the person or family cannot be found in

any printed work. Wherever it seems advisable and there is sufficient information, a genealogical table is made to show family relationships with greater ease and brevity.

The business of actually reading through collections may sound very formidable to the beginner, and admittedly it is time-consuming, but it is necessary for an adequate knowledge of the holdings under one's care. Even with extensive indexes much of the usefulness of a collection depends upon the curator's own knowledge of its content. It is comparable to a reference librarian's familiarity with his reference collection, and if anything, more necessary. With some experience the curator is soon able to read rapidly, estimate in short order the comparative value of any given collection, and apportion the time he will devote to it in accordance with its importance.

Five years had sufficed to establish a working system. Accessions were adequately listed. NYA student help was available to do the mechanical arranging, counting, and typing of cards. The permanent staff could thus devote its time chiefly to that part of the work requiring greater knowledge and experience. Still there was considerable rounding out necessary before the system would approach completeness. One necessity was a file listing collections by state. This need arose from the frequency with which patrons would ask, "What material do you have on Georgia?" or Virginia, Mississippi, or any other state. This geographic file, established in 1937, has had sufficient use to justify its maintenance.

In 1936 the Association of Research Libraries sponsored a movement to establish a union list of manuscript collections in depositories throughout the country. Various considerations made it necessary to list Duke's holdings for this project, regardless of the additional work and difficulties involved. The information on these cards included a brief statement of the nature of each collection, inclusive dates, place, number of pieces, whether arranged, indexed, or calendared, the names together with number of letters of each important person represented in the collection, and finally a listing of the chief subjects covered, following the form of Library of Congress subject headings. The cards sent in covered 330 of Duke's most important collections, plus a number of individual items. Identical cards were kept for our own information, and from these cards a subject index was begun in 1937. This subject catalogue remains at present quite incomplete and not entirely satisfactory, but considerably better than nothing and often very useful. Since the subject entries refer to

entire collections or substantial parts thereof, it will be seen that this file is by no means a specific guide to material, yet it is much better than dependence on memory. The writer believes that the ideal method would be an extensive subject catalogue indexing by subject all individual pieces of consequence. The amount of work and time involved in such a procedure make it impracticable, however, except for those nonexistent ideal institutions where time, space, and staff are adequate for every conceivable need.

Perhaps some comment on physical equipment is pertinent. The chief characteristic of the varied containers for loose manuscripts now in use is their unsuitability for the purpose to which they are being applied. At least that has been the writer's observation. At this point one sooner or later runs into the controversy over vertical filing versus flat filing. On this subject the writer is a constant and firm advocate of flat filing for loose papers. Those who hold to vertical filing always defend their view on the basis of its saving space. The present writer has never been able to see why a given amount of material occupies more space when laid flat than when in vertical position. That inability may be due, however, to an unmathematical mind. In any case, however, the fundamental purpose of preservation in good condition is infinitely better served by flat filing. No matter what the equipment in vertical filing, sooner or later the edges of the manuscripts fray and tear and papers slip and get wrinkled or creased. In flat filing all these troubles are avoided. The equipment used at Duke is a steel filing box 10¾ inches wide, 14½ inches long, and 2⅝ inches deep. The lid overlaps the sides of the box ⅝ inch, opens from the right hand side and on the left has double hinges at top and bottom edges, so that when opened the folders and manuscripts can be freely examined or removed without danger of bending or tearing. The universal objection to steel filing boxes is the cost. This writer does not believe that objection can be sustained, and submits that aside from the advantages of permanency, durability, and less bulk, steel containers are no more expensive than several varieties of composition box. The steel boxes of the Duke equipment are placed on specially built steel shelving arranged so that each unit accommodates one filing box.

The department began with no reference works and a very limited knowledge of such aids on the part of its staff. Over a period of years a limited working collection has been built up composed chiefly of biographical dictionaries. When occasion demands, all possible bio-

graphical guides of a local nature are consulted. Other useful aids in identifying names include *The Virginia Historical Index,* the general index volume of the *Official Records of the War of the Rebellion,* and the index in *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War.* These samples serve to reflect the great amount of Confederate material handled, which presents various peculiar problems of its own. In identifying places an atlas and a gazetteer are essential, but often most useful are the early postal guides issued by the United States Post Office Department. Three or four of these guides for various dates throughout the nineteenth century are a constant aid in locating now extinct towns or showing the county in which a given town was at a specified time.

A good collection and good equipment will suffer, however, without a reasonably well trained personnel. Requirements in this direction must necessarily vary with the nature of the holdings in each institution. Staff members at Duke have been almost entirely candidates for the Ph.D. degree in history or graduate students in English. This does not of course automatically mean a good staff, but it indicates the kind of training most useful for work with Duke's collection of southern Americana which is chiefly source material in American history and literature. The greater the curator's knowledge of history the better he will be able to evaluate his collection and interpret it for others. Mere antiquarian of genealogical curiosity is not enough; a solid understanding of the content and import of American history is essential. Coupled with this must be an ever growing knowledge of names and still more names until a sense of spotting the great, the near great, and the locally prominent will prevent passing over letters of persons for whom, sooner or later, someone will be searching.

For the first three or four years the Duke manuscripts department was almost solely occupied with the preparation of materials for use. There was comparatively little use. Duke's holdings were not then sufficiently extensive or widely enough known to attract many investigators. As the Duke collection became more widely known—chiefly by the grapevine route—the number of visiting investigators gradually increased, along with growing use by local students and faculty. From a few dozen in each of the early years, patronage grew to 718 during 1939-1940.

The holdings at the end of 1933, as noted above, were about 221,000. During the next seven years accessions averaged around

50,000 items per year, the lowest figure for any year being 38,000 while the highest was 93,000. Holdings now total over 650,000 items. This is not the place to mention the many important collections added during these years; they are available elsewhere.[1]

The most pressing problem still remains the reduction of a constant and increasing backlog of unworked materials. The rapid growth in service to the public, both personally and by correspondence, has severely cut into the time that could be devoted to actual preparation of materials for use. While student help has aided greatly in speeding the mechanical work, undergraduates cannot be trained or expected to do the professional work necessary for each collection. With only a small trained staff this has created a bottleneck which is now somewhat relieved by the addition of a part-time staff member. With a satisfactory procedure established the chief problem is now to maintain it on a reasonable standard of accuracy and consistency, with the unavoidable handicaps of a small staff and crowded quarters.

RUTH K. NUERMBERGER

Duke University Library

[1] *A Guide to the Manuscript Collections in the Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.* Prepared by the Historical Records Survey, Works Progress Administration. (Raleigh, N.C., 1939, mimeographed.) *In Memoriam. William Kenneth Boyd. January 10, 1879-January 19, 1938,* in Trinity College, Durham, North Carolina, Historical Society, *Historical Papers,* Series XXII (Durham, North Carolina, Duke University Press, 1938).

SOME PROBLEMS OF STATE ARCHIVAL ADMINISTRATION[1]

THE administrative machinery for the handling of state archives varies from one commonwealth to another. Some of us in this field are under departments of archives and history or historical commissions, others are under state libraries, others are under secretaries of state or other officials, while still others are connected with state historical societies. Whatever our connection, however, all of us are faced with certain common problems, a few of which I shall undertake to discuss briefly.

First, and perhaps most fundamental of all, is the problem of winning recognition as the official state archival agency. Nothing is more discouraging than to labor for years in the care of the official records, only to discover that the department upstairs or across the street does not even know that we exist. Most of us at one time or another have learned that important records were being destroyed under our very noses, and have had to take hurried action to save what we could. Buildings or storage rooms to hold public records are often constructed without anyone taking the trouble to ask our advice, though we are supposed to be experts in that field.

There are no simple and easy solutions of the many aspects of this problem. We are compelled to advance slowly, step by step, and sometimes we wonder if we are advancing at all. Basic, however, is the need for proper laws along the lines worked out by Dr. Newsome's Committee on Uniform State Legislation. Such legislation should provide especially that: (*a*) official records must be preserved, except where their destruction has been duly authorized; (*b*) useless records may be destroyed according to certain procedure; (*c*) noncurrent records may be transferred to the archival agency with the consent of the custodian; and (*d*) the archival agency shall have general supervision over the care, preservation, and disposal of the records of all departments, agencies, and institutions of the state government.

Armed with such legislation, the archivist is in a position to approach many problems. Usually, however, he cannot force issues and often it is best for him not to insist on strict obedience of the law, at

[1] A paper read at the fourth annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists at Montgomery, Alabama, November 12, 1940.

least for the time being. Tact and more tact are needed in winning the support and co-operation of other departments, and many setbacks are to be expected.

Encouraging is the fact that progress tends to be cumulative. Once it has become customary for such matters to be referred to the archival agency, our authority comes to be increasingly recognized.

Second is the problem of better public relations, a topic admirably and amusingly discussed by Dr. McCain at our meeting a year ago.[2] By nature most of our work is specialized and technical, so that the general public may be expected to know little or nothing about it. Then too, there are so few archivists that we do not now, and probably never will, benefit from the weight of numbers.

Dealing as we do with records relating to the past, we tend constantly to be drawn away from the present. And yet if we are to deal with the public, we cannot afford to become mere mossbacks or antiquarians even though some of our number might find it easy and natural to do so.

Probably there is not one of us who does not have an opportunity to develop better public relations to the advantage of his department. Many of us have a tendency to look down upon genealogists, patriotic groups, and the like, Actually, however, these people can be of real service in winning popular support for our program. We need especially to keep the general public better informed as to what we are doing. Often the masses of the people do not even know that our agencies are in existence, and it is our duty to make them know. The platform, the radio, and the newspaper offer us opportunities in this field. Particularly worthy of our consideration is the issuance of regular press releases along the lines so successfully followed in such states as Missouri and Minnesota. In so far a possible such releases should be closely tied in with our archival work and should seek constantly to drive home the service we perform in preserving the records of the past.

In this connection there would seem to be a real advantage in bringing about a close co-ordination of our archival work with other historical activities in our respective states. Various phases of archival and historical endeavor may be developed so as to supplement and strengthen each other and to develop public support for the entire program. A certain eminent archivist recently said to me, "We are

[2] William D. McCain, "The Public Relations of Archival Depositories," THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST, III (October, 1940), 235-244.

lucky in that our agency does not have to bother with an historical museum." A museum might have been a bother to him, but it could have done much to interest the public in his work. For the general populace will never see the inside of archives' stack areas or even of search rooms, but tens of thousands of persons will visit annually the displays in historical museums. If these are maintained in connection with archives and if they make a point of displaying significant and timely historical documents, there will be a gain all the way around.

In order to be most effective, a state archival program should be a part of a broad, general plan of historical and archival work. The marking of historic spots, the preservation of historic sites and buildings, the stimulation of local historical society activities, co-operation with patriotic and other organizations, the promotion of the writing of better state and local histories—these, and other similar activities are phases of such a program. Of course, the archival agency will hardly be in a position to engage directly and immediately in all these activities. But the persons who control the agency's policies will do well to think in terms of such a comprehensive program and to promote it as far as possible.

Third and always of great concern is the problem of financing our program. All of us are constantly being forced to give up or postpone some undertaking which, if we could only afford it, would probably be of value. Frequently when we present our case to the state fiscal authorities we get exactly nowhere. Legislatures have a way of becoming economy-minded especially where so-called cultural agencies such as libraries, archives, and museums are concerned.

Obviously there is no magic formula which will solve all our varying problems in this field, but I would like to suggest that the broad, general historical, and archival program mentioned above would go far to build up the needed popular backing for increased financial support.

Fourth, pressing at the present time though perhaps not of permanent importance, is the problem of our relationship with federal relief agencies, especially the WPA Historical Records Survey. With state archival agencies so limited for funds, the expenditure of tens of millions of federal relief money for historical and archival work has been a godsend. In my own state, for example, the Historical Records Survey for the past four years has been spending more than four times the appropriation of the historical commission. Such an

expenditure has made it possible to sort, arrange, and inventory vast quantities of records; to conduct research in the history of many administrative units where these records originated; and to render many other services which could not have been financed otherwise. I feel confident that I speak for the majority of state archival agencies when I express appreciation and gratitude for the aid which the Historical Records Survey and other federal projects have given.

On our part there would seem to be a definite obligation to cooperate in this work. We should facilitate the research activities, aid in gaining access to depositories of records, make contacts with proper state and local officials, provide as far as possible the requisite sponsor's contributions, organize committees of librarians and historians to undertake long-range planning, and in other ways render assistance.

On the other hand, perhaps we are not ungrateful or unreasonable if we suggest that certain modifications in the regulations controlling these projects would be advantageous. The requirements for sponsor's contributions are already large, and the tendency seems to be to make them constantly larger. Too little nonrelief labor is allowed, and there are other restrictions which hamper the achievement of results which, at least from our point of view, seem desirable. One would think that it might be possible to alter the regulations so that it would be easier to get something accomplished without in any way sacrificing the major purpose of the relief program of providing work for the unemployed.

Is it possible that the Historical Records Survey might be set up as a permanent program of the federal government? I feel that most state archival agencies would welcome such a step.

Lastly, let us consider the problem of the destruction of records. From time to time there has been some discussion of this matter, but I doubt whether any of us have yet faced it realistically. The sheer mass of correspondence files, payroll sheets, vouchers, time reports, and the thousands of other series of records which our government is constantly producing, is destined, if we do not take drastic action, to bury us under a veritable avalanche. At the present rate every one of our state capital cities will eventually be covered by mountains of archives; novelists of the future will write about the last days of Montgomery or Springfield or Annapolis; and archeologists will excavate our remains and attempt to recreate our life before the "archivruption."

The problem is one which calls for bold thinking and drastic action. For the past few years we archivists have laid stress chiefly upon the saving and preserving of records. The public has needed, and still needs, to be made conscious of the value of records in general before it can be ready for an intelligent program for the destruction of certain records in particular. Now, however, while we should continue to educate the public, we ought at the same time to be planning among ourselves what we are going to do to get rid of a large portion of the records. The microfilm will help, and so will other devices and processes. But our chief problem is to work out principles and procedures for the destruction of useless records. There are going to be difficult questions to decide and many of us may find that the action which is called for will trouble our archival consciences. But unless we act promptly and effectively the solution of the problem will continue to go by default, and archives, valuable and worthless, significant and unimportant will continue to be dumped in the ash can or carted off by the junk man.

These, briefly, are a few of the present problems in the field of state archival administration: winning recognition as the official archival agency, establishing better public relations, financing our program, dealing with federal relief projects, and formulating a workable plan for the destruction of useless records.

C. C. Crittenden

The North Carolina Historical Commission

THE ARCHIVES OF NEW YORK

THE archives of the state of New York have presented problems in care and preservation ever since Peter Stuyvesant stipulated in the articles of surrender by which he turned over New Netherlands to the English that the records of the colony be carefully preserved.[1] His wishes were carried out, and the old Dutch records have survived, in a more or less complete state, many vicissitudes, including three disastrous fires, and constitute today one of the most valued parts of the archives of the state of New York.

At the outbreak of the Revolution, Governor Tryon carried part of the records of the colony including the Dutch records to England with him. By the Treaty of Paris of 1783, they were to be returned to this country, and, after some rather intensive searching by Lord George Germaine, they were located in an obscure storage place and brought back.[2] Immediately upon their return, they were deposited with the secretary of state at Albany where they remained untouched and almost forgotten until 1804, when a law was passed directing the translation of the Dutch records. In 1818, Francis Adrian Van Der Kemp was commissioned by Governor DeWitt Clinton to do this work. His translations, contained in twenty-four manuscript volumes, were later characterized as "inaccurate, superficial, and of no value whatever."[3]

After Van Der Kemp's translation was made (it never was published and was destroyed in the fire of 1911[4]), nothing more was done with the records until 1839, when, in response to a memorial addressed to the state legislature by the New York Historical Society, an act was passed appropriating $4,000 for the employment of an agent to visit depositories in England, France, and Holland, for the purpose of acquiring copies of documents relating to the colonial history of New York state. J. Romeyn Brodhead was appointed agent and immediately went to work. Additional funds were later appropriated, $3,000 in 1842, and $5,000 in 1843. Sixteen volumes of copies of records were obtained in Holland, forty-seven in London, and seventeen in Paris, which were all deposited in the office of the

[1] George W. Schuyler, *Colonial New York* (2 vols., New York, 1885), I, v.
[2] *Ibid.*, vi.
[3] American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1906, II, 355.
[4] New York State Library, *94th Annual Report*, 1911, 19-32.

secretary of state at Albany, and in 1849 the munificent sum of $600 was appropriated to employ an extra clerk to arrange and translate them. Edmund Bailey O'Callaghan was appointed to this post.[5] O'Callaghan was an Irish physician who had been banished from Canada for taking part in a French uprising against British authority. He fled to the United States and was employed by the state to translate its Dutch and French records into English. His labors bore fruit in two notable works, the *Documentary History of the State of New York*,[6] which was composed largely of documents already in the office of the secretary of state, and the first ten volumes of the *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York*,[7] which consisted of the translations of the copies of documents obtained abroad by Brodhead and an index by O'Callaghan.[8] All this work was done in the office of the secretary of state at Albany.

It is necessary at this point to consider an institution peculiar to New York state, the University of the State of New York, for it has gradually gained complete control over archival work in that state. The University of the State of New York was founded in 1784, and a Board of Regents was created to govern it. The university was not itself an institution for academic instruction. Rather, it consisted of all the colleges, academies, and academic departments of the common schools of the state. The Board of Regents of the university exercised supervision over the institutions of higher learning and had some control over them through the distribution of the "Literature Fund." As time went on, it absorbed the state library (1844),[9] the state museum (1889),[10] the Department of Public Instruction (1904),[11] the State Historian's Office (1911), and the office of the Supervisor of Public Records (1911).[12] It now constitutes the department of education of the state and supervises all phases of that very broad field of activities, including all archival activities. The

[5] Franklin B. Hough, *Historical and Statistical Record of the University of the State of New York during the Century from 1784 to 1884* (Albany, 1885), 777.

[6] Edmund B. O'Callaghan, ed., *The Documentary History of the State of New York* (4 vols., Albany, 1850-1851).

[7] Edmund B. O'Callaghan and others, eds., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York* (15 vols., Albany, 1856-1883).

[8] Hough, *op. cit.*, 777.

[9] *Ibid.*, 6.

[10] *Laws of New York*, 1889, ch. 529.

[11] *Ibid.*, 1904, ch. 40.

[12] *Ibid.*, 1911, ch. 380.

university's agencies for carrying on the archival work of the state are the New York State Library and the Division of Archives and History under the state historian.

The first of these two agencies, the New York State Library, was organized in 1818 as a "Public Library for the use of the government and people of the State,"[13] and was to be governed by a board of trustees. In 1844, the regents of the university were made the board of trustees,[14] and in 1889 the state library became an integral part of the university.[15]

Up to 1847, all noncurrent records had remained in the custody of the secretary of state, but on December 15 of that year an event of considerable importance took place. It was the transfer by joint resolution of the legislature, of certain "ancient documents" from the office of the secretary of state "now kept in the storeroom of his department" to the custody of the regents of the university "to be preserved in the State Library."[16] This was the first of a number of similar transfers, the most important of which took place in 1881. By the terms of an act of the legislature of that year, certain records from the office of the secretary of state and the office of the comptroller were transferred "to the care of the trustees of the State Library," and provision was made for a custodian to care for the records and make authentic copies of them.[17] These records included the great bulk of the colonial archives of the state and formed the first large archival deposit in the New York State Library. The records transferred in 1881 are listed in Berthold Fernow's report to the trustees of the New York State Library[18] and also in Professor Herbert L. Osgood's monumental "Report on the Public Archives of New York" made in 1900 for the Public Archives Commission of the American Historical Association.[19] It is well to note that the transfer of 1881 was of specified records at a particular time.

An act passed in 1892, which clarified the position of the state library and defined its powers, duties, and contents, is of particular interest. It reads, in part, as follows:

SECTION 10. The state library and state museum shall be departments

[13] *Ibid.*, 1818, ch. 41.
[14] Hough, *op. cit.*, 12.
[15] *Laws of New York*, 1889, ch. 529, sec. 16.
[16] N.Y. Assembly, 1849. *Document* 148.
[17] *Laws of New York*, 1881, ch. 120.
[18] New York State Library, *Sixty-fourth Annual Report*, 1881, 11-15.
[19] American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1900, II, 69-250.

of the University . . . [and] shall be under exclusive control of the regents who shall have all powers of trustees thereof.

. . . . . .

SEC. 15. All books, pamphlets, manuscripts, records, archives and maps, and all other property appropriate to a general library, if owned by the state and not placed in other custody by law, shall be in charge of the regents and shall constitute the state library.

SEC. 16. Manuscripts or printed papers of the legislature . . . on file more than five years in the custody of the senate and assembly clerks, and all public records of the state not placed in other custody by a specific law shall be a part of the state library. . . .

. . . . . .

SEC. 20. The librarian of any library owned by the state, or the officer in charge of any state department, bureau, board, commission or other office may, with the approval of the regents, transfer to the permanent custody of the state library or museum any books, papers, maps, manuscripts, specimens or other articles which, because of being duplicates or for other reasons, will in his judgment be more useful to the state in the state library or museum than if retained in his keeping.[20]

All of the records transferred from the departments to the state library since 1892 have been transferred under this law, except certain records from the office of the secretary of state, which were transferred in 1907 under a law of that year amending the law of 1881.[21]

The two laws passed in 1881 and in 1892 are the bases on which the state library was made the depository for state archives and on which its Manuscripts Section (now the Manuscripts and History Section) was created. Berthold Fernow was appointed clerk in charge of the records in 1881 and served until 1889 when he retired. He was succeeded by George R. Howell, who was given the title of archivist and made head of the Manuscripts Section. On Howell's death in 1899, he was succeeded by Arnold J. F. Van Laer.

In the spring of 1911 came one of those catastrophes that occasionally overtake public record offices. Early in the morning of March 29, a fire started in an assembly committee room in the capitol at Albany, spread rapidly to the state library reading room and threatened to consume the whole building. It was, however, confined to the west end of the capitol, where it destroyed the state library which was housed in the three upper stories. About ten per cent of the books and ten per cent of the manuscripts were saved.

[20] *Laws of New York*, 1892, ch. 378.
[21] *Ibid.*, 1907, ch. 274.

The fire and the salvage operation afterward are most vividly described in the *Annual Report* of the director of the state library for 1911. In that report also is a list of the collections in the Manuscripts Section with a statement of the loss sustained by each.[22] This should always be referred to in connection with the report of Osgood mentioned above to obtain a true picture of the present status of the early records of New York.

The next year the whole university moved into the new Education Building across the street, which had been standing vacant and ready when the fire occurred. In these splendid new quarters the state library began afresh and its Manuscripts Section has been gradually recovering from the effects of the fire. Most of the old Dutch records and the "ancient documents" transferred in 1847 were saved. Since 1911, the state library has received much interesting and valuable material, but most of the state records are still in the offices of origin.

So far the state records have been under consideration. What of the local records? The function of supervision of the records of the political subdivisions of the state had its origin in a law passed by the state legislature in 1895.[23] By the terms of this act the position of state historian was created as an independent office. The state historian was to be appointed by the governor, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and was to "collect, collate, compile, edit, and prepare for publication all official records, memoranda, and data relative to the colonial wars, War of the Revolution, War of 1812, Mexican War, and War of the Rebellion, together with all official records, memoranda, and statistics affecting the relations between this commonwealth and foreign powers, between this state and other states, and between this state and the United States." The first incumbent, Hugh Hastings, for whom the job was created as a reward for party service, did very little aside from publishing certain files of records. In 1907, Governor Hughes appointed as state historian Victor Hugo Paltsits, who immediately began to work for a law broadening the work of his office to include the inspection and supervision of local records.[24] He had by 1910 almost succeeded in obtaining such a law, when as a result of some political influence exercised by the commissioner of education, the bill was thrown out of the

[22] New York State Library, *94th Annual Report*, 1911, 7-34.
[23] *Laws of New York*, 1895, ch. 393.
[24] New York State Historical Association, *Proceedings*, VIII, 209-221.

legislature.[25] Paltsits resigned.[26] The next year a more comprehensive bill was passed, which created in the university the Division of Public Records to supervise the preservation of local archives.[27] In 1913, the law was amended to place the state historian's office under the university as the Division of History.[28] James A. Holden was continued as state historian, to which post he had been named when Paltsits resigned. Later the two divisions were merged to form the Division of Archives and History and the supervisor of public records became a subordinate of the state historian. Van Laer, who had been head of the Manuscripts Section of the state library with the title of archivist, was transferred to the new division, retaining his title, and was put in charge of the translation of the Dutch records. He retired from active duty on November 1, 1939, after forty years of distinguished service to the state of New York.

The basis for the work of the supervisor of public records is the law of 1913[29] which is now published as Sections 1190 to 1198 of the Education Law. It provides that the university shall have control over all records of any public office or civil division of the state that becomes extinct, unless disposition of the records is otherwise provided by law; that the officers of any political division of the state or any institution created under any law of the state may deposit their old records with the university and that the regents of the university must accept them; that the supervisor of public records shall examine the condition of all public records of all political subdivisions of the state and other public records created under any law of the state in such political subdivisions, except Kings County or New York County; that the term "public records" shall include "any written or printed book or paper, or map, which is the property of the state or of any county, city, town or village or part thereof, and in or on which any entry has been made or is required to be made by law, or which any officer or employee of the state or of a county, city, town or village has received or is required to receive for filing"; that public records must be inscribed in durable ink on linen paper, durably made and well-finished; that the Division of Public Records shall take all measures for the proper inscription, retrieval, care, and preservation of the public records, except in Kings County and New York County;

[25] *Ibid.*, IX, 212-215.
[26] *Ibid.*, 218.
[27] *Laws of New York*, 1911, ch. 380.
[28] *Ibid.*, 1913, ch. 424.
[29] *Ibid.*

that the Division of Public Records shall advise and make recommendations to public officers in the political subdivisions as to materials to be used and as to the safety and preservation of the public records, such recommendations to be enforced by orders issued by justices of the Supreme Court upon the application of the commissioner of education, either with or without notice to the officers concerned; that public officers shall have records suitably bound and shall provide safes or vaults for the safe-keeping of records; that no papers shall be destroyed without the commissioner of education first being notified and his consent being obtained; that officers shall notify the commissioner of education if their records are accidentally destroyed by fire; and that a penalty of twenty dollars per month may be imposed on any officer for neglecting to comply with a recommendation of the commissioner of education.[30]

Under the heading of recommendations, the present Division of Archives and History has drawn up some rather stringent conditions to which custodians of local records must conform. They must provide suitable quarters for their records, with noncombustible fittings and furnishings and with safes and vaults approved by the division; they must keep certain records in the safe or vault when they are not actually in use, and all others must be kept in a reasonably safe place; and all records must be so arranged and filed that they may be conveniently examined.[31]

The state historian has commented in his recent reports on the fine co-operation that he has been receiving from local officers. In 1914, the first year after the passage of the Public Records Law, he noted that $500,000 was spent by local officers to meet the requirements of the act.[32] He has seldom had even to threaten to impose the penalty prescribed for neglecting his recommendations.

An interesting development in the field of local archival and historical work was the creation in 1919 of the office of local historian for any city, borough, town, or village, and the granting of permission to counties to appoint county historians.[33] The principal duties

[30] New York Education Law, Secs. 1192-1198. (The Education Law was enacted as Chapter 21 of the *Laws of New York*, 1909, and as Chapter 16 of the *Consolidated Laws of New York*. It is now (1941), Chapter 15 of the *Consolidated Laws of New York*.)

[31] American Historical Association, Public Archives Commission, *The Preservation of Local Archives* (Washington, 1932), 11.

[32] University of the State of New York, *Eleventh Annual Report of the Education Department*, 1915, 499.

[33] New York Education Law, Secs. 1198, 1199a.

of these officers are to collect historical data in their areas, to inquire into the status of local records, and to notify the state historian of anything warranting his attention.[34] In his report for 1931, Alexander C. Flick, state historian from 1923 to 1939, mentioned the fact that Governor Roosevelt had recommended the erection of a memorial hall to serve, in part, as a central archives depository, under the direction of the state historian.[35] In his next report, Dr. Flick again urged the establishment of such a depository, and that the school district records be placed under the provision of the Public Records Act. Neither of these things has yet been done, in spite of continuous agitation for them by the state historian.

The archival situation in New York shows a multiplicity of agencies concerned with archival matters and a division of powers. State records may be deposited in the state library, but few of them have been, and there are not adequate facilities to take care of any great quantities of them. There is no special care or supervision of the records remaining in the departments. Local records may be deposited in the Division of Archives and History which must accept all records that are offered to it for safe-keeping. Local officers have availed themselves freely of this privilege, and there is at present a very considerable shortage of available space. There is however strict supervision and safeguarding of local records in the offices of origin. A reasonable solution of the problem would be to provide an adequate central archival depository for both state and local records; to cause the compulsory and continuous transfer to such a depository of all noncurrent records both state and local of more than a certain age, say twenty-five years; and to extend to the records in the state offices the strict supervision and safeguarding now in effect concerning the local records.

Edward F. Rowse

Washington, D.C.

[34] *Ibid.*

[35] University of the State of New York, *Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Education Department*, 1931, I, 274.

EXTENSION SERVICE RECORDS IN ALABAMA[1]

CO-OPERATIVE extension work in agriculture and home economics dates its beginning from the passage of the Smith-Lever Act, May 8, 1914. It was an outgrowth of farmers' institutes, long established in all parts of the country, and of a more recent attempt of the states and the federal government to aid rural people through what was known as the Farmers' Co-operative Demonstration Work.

The appearance of the cotton boll weevil in Texas at about the turn of the twentieth century caused great alarm among both farmers and business men of the South. The aid of the federal government was sought in order to find a means of checking the pest, and if possible to perfect an improved method of growing cotton in the infected areas. In 1904 the Bureau of Plant Industry of the Department of Agriculture was given a small appropriation to carry out this work, and Dr. Seaman A. Knapp was designated the special agent in charge.

As the boll weevil spread eastward from Texas, year after year enveloping a greater area, the General Education Board agreed to appropriate funds to organize southeastern states not yet reached by the weevil but directly in the path of its destruction. This was to give farmers an opportunity to learn to produce cotton under actual boll weevil conditions so that no time would be lost when the pest finally arrived. Alabama was organized in Farmers' Co-operative Demonstration Work in 1907, which was three years before the boll weevil made its appearance in the state.

All funds for improving cotton production were administered by the Bureau of Plant Industry, which appointed demonstration agents in the various states. These traveling agents were under the immediate supervision of the directors of the state experiment stations and worked in close co-operation with them. Annually from 1908 to 1914 the director of the experiment station in Alabama made a report of progress to Dr. Knapp in the Bureau of Plant Industry, and, no doubt, frequently corresponded with him regarding the work in Alabama. Today, however, there are only a few scattered records which throw any light on this early phase of agricultural extension work.

[1] A paper read at the fourth annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists at Montgomery, Alabama, November 11, 1940.

In 1920 the agricultural building at Auburn was destroyed by fire and all the records were lost. Unfortunately, a careful check of early Alabama records in the Bureau of Plant Industry and the National Archives in Washington reveals many gaps, and one must assume that certain correspondence must have been either destroyed or misplaced in shifting the bureau from one agricultural building to another.

Since Farmers' Co-operative Demonstration Work in the South was supported by two separate appropriations, Dr. Seaman Knapp, the special agent, made an annual report to both the General Education Board and the Department of Agriculture. These reports, running from 1906 to 1913, contain useful bits of information concerning the work in Alabama and are still filed in the Washington Extension Service office.

All available records concerned with the Farmers' Co-operative Demonstration Work in Alabama have been carefully examined by the writer, but gaps in essential source materials make it exceedingly difficult to reconstruct an accurate picture of the beginnings of agricultural demonstration work in Alabama. Omissions will have to be filled partially by available printed materials, and perhaps the most significant of these are the early bulletins and the annual reports of the state experiment station. Two bibliographies of printed materials which deal with extension service work in all the states have been compiled by the library of the Office of Experiment Stations in Washington. Materials are listed under topics as well as by states, and although not complete they are of considerable aid to the student.

The Farmers' Co-operative Demonstration Work was replaced in 1914 by co-operative extension work in agriculture and home economics under the Smith-Lever Act, which gave rise to the present Extension Service. There are no records available on the campus of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute for the first six years of the Extension Service. Fortunately, however, copies of all reports compiled during this period, as well as much of the director's correspondence with the Washington extension office, have now been catalogued and made available by the agricultural division of the National Archives. It is the practice of the Washington extension office to keep in its current files all state records less than four years old. The others have been deposited with the National Archives.

Since 1921 the Alabama Extension Service has maintained at Auburn an accumulative file which consists of weekly, monthly, and

annual reports of county and home demonstration agents and of the subject matter specialists. In addition, there are annual reports of the director, members of the overhead staff, such as the state home demonstration agent, district supervisors, 4-H Club leaders, and the agricultural editor, besides personnel records, general correspondence, departmental budgets, vouchers, and other financial statements. All records for the current year are kept in the departmental office files and at the end of the year are transferred to the general files, which at present consist of seventy-nine four-drawer sections of steel filing cases containing approximately 150,000 pieces of manuscript.

The county and home demonstration agents in each of Alabama's sixty-seven counties have their individual office files which contain copies of letters written to the director of extension, their district supervisors and the subject matter specialists regarding various problems in the field. Also, there is considerable miscellaneous correspondence with local farmers, business men, and others who seek information which the county agent's office is in a position to supply.

Since 1933 the agricultural extension service has been working in close co-operation in an advisory capacity with the so-called federal action agencies, such as the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Soil Conservation Service, Farm Security Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Tennessee Valley Authority, and others. As a result, considerable correspondence involving technical considerations and matters of policy passes between the Extension Service and the state and regional offices of these various agencies.

All records dealing with Negro extension work are filed at Tuskegee Institute, eighteen miles from Auburn. They consist principally of the same type of materials as the ones found in the records of the white staff, but in addition there are also the reports and correspondence of the Negro field agent of the lower southern states. In order that the white and the Negro extension programs may be focused on the same general objectives and kept somewhat together, a member of the overhead staff at Auburn is designated as a co-ordinator of Negro work. He keeps in direct contact with Negro county and home demonstration agents, as well as with the administrative staff at Tuskegee Institute. His annual report to the director of extension thus includes a brief summary of Negro work carried on in Alabama.

Practically all Extension Service reports are voluminous and detailed. The county agents, for example, give both a statistical and narrative account of the year's work. Much space is devoted to tabu-

lating the number of demonstrations held, attendance, days spent in the office and days in the field, and various types of county statistics, usually compiled from the census, regarding rural population changes, production figures, and other crop statistics. The narrative phase of the report tells of the methods used in contacting people, problems involved in promoting the various projects, and results or conclusions if any are evident. The county and home demonstration agents usually include in the narrative phase of their reports human interest stories and clippings from local newspapers regarding their work.

The schedule and major projects for the year's work are agreed upon at a program planning conference in which both the overhead and field staffs participate. Various types of projects such as dairying, pastures, field crops, cotton production, poultry, home furnishings, food preservation, dressmaking, and the like are set up with reference to the needs of particular counties. Some of these may be intended to run for a period of several years, and thus an annual report is merely a report of progress.

Specialists, supervisors, and other members of the overhead staff tell of their activities in annual narrative reports and emphasize their particular contributions to projects in operation in the several counties. The agricultural editor usually includes in his report sample articles illustrating the various types of news service to daily papers, county weeklies, agricultural magazines, and radio programs, as well as a narrative summary of the major accomplishments of the publicity department for the particular year.

The most significant of all reports for purposes of historical research are those of the director of extension, made jointly to the president of the state land-grant college and the Washington extension office. It is actually a synthesis of all other reports in the entire organization. There are sections devoted to plan of work, administration, appropriations, county agents, home demonstration work, Negro work, farmer organizations, publications, action agencies, the present agricultural condition of the state, and generally a summary of the work done.

Perhaps even more valuable for the research student is the state director's voluminous correspondence, which is available as far back as 1920. It not only touches on all phases of agricultural development in the state, but it reveals much information regarding various

kinds of agricultural legislation, both local and national. The director's office is to some extent a clearing house of information between the state and the United States Department of Agriculture, and in this capacity forms a connecting link between the farmer and the Washington office.

Though for over a quarter of a century the Extension Service has been working toward the betterment of rural life and the general uplift of farm people, it is becoming more difficult each year to trace its direct influence in terms of higher crop yields due to soil improving practices and better methods of production. Since 1933 federal action agencies have come into the agricultural field and by means of controlled production, subsidies, grants-in-aid, and loans have been able to bring about a rapid change in farming methods which will, no doubt, lead eventually to a higher standard of living for the farm family. Whether this change is the result of a twenty-five-year-old educational program developed by the Extension Service or the pressure of action agencies it is yet too soon to tell. Technically speaking, the action agencies do not invade the province of the agricultural extension service, but their indirect influence is definitely felt.

Since agricultural extension work has been organized and administered by the land-grant colleges and forms an important phase of the colleges' broad program, these agricultural records thus become the medium through which the student is able to trace and evaluate the contribution made in educating rural people through a system of nonresident instruction conducted by the county agents. These agents are charged with carrying to the people in practical form useful information assembled by the research and teaching staffs of the colleges.

Taken as a whole, Extension Service records are valuable as an important part of the source materials dealing with agricultural history in Alabama since 1910. To a large extent, however, they pertain to the field of agricultural education, and by themselves cover only one phase of the state's agricultural development. Thus it is evident that any comprehensive research in recent agricultural history must be supplemented with other sources if conclusions are to be reached.

In years past inadequate storage facilities for records gave rise to a disorganized filing system, which is a definite handicap in using some of the earlier records. However, with better housing facilities

and improved filing equipment this condition has been greatly improved, and it is now possible to locate a particular type of record without loss of time. This is important to those doing research in agricultural history in Alabama, for in my opinion no study of the state's agricultural development since 1900 could be complete without a careful analysis of these records.

Charles S. Davis

Alabama Polytechnic Institute

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

EMMETT J. LEAHY, Editor
Box 6154, Washington, D.C.

Public Administration and the United States Department of Agriculture, by John M. Gaus and Leon O. Wolcott, with a chapter by Verne B. Lewis. (Chicago. Public Administration Service, 1940. Pp. x, 534. $4.50.)

This study of administration under our federal system of government is one of many sponsored by the Committee on Public Administration of the Social Science Research Council. Its objectives are twofold: to encourage study of the way in which the federal system is applied to the solution of regional and local agricultural problems by the Department of Agriculture through collaboration with local institutions, and to show the nature of executive departments generally by a study of the administration of the Department of Agriculture in particular.

The study is divided into three sections. In the first the evolution of the Department of Agriculture as a functional organism is traced from 1862 to the present, in the second a cross-sectional analysis is made of the basic functions of the department and of the organic entities or administrative units which perform them, and in the third, the head of the organism, or, to use the biological analogy of the authors, "the organizing activity of the organism," by which the functions of its various parts are co-ordinated and directed is examined.

In the first part of the study, the development of this organism, to continue the use of biological terms, is shown until 1939, by which time it has "come of age" as a department. Its origins are traced to the agricultural activities of the Patent Office—a rather irregular paternity—an office which in 1839 received the first agricultural appropriations made by the federal government. By the organic act of 1862, which established the Department of Agriculture, these activities were legitimated. Under the Commissioners of Agriculture, from 1862 to 1889, when the department achieved its majority by its elevation to full executive status, the major functions are indicated to be "research in the sciences basic to agriculture, facilitation of production, and facilitation of marketing." The department was thus growing up with the country. Its activities were keyed to the needs of a frontier society. With the passing of the frontier, its activities, like those of the federal government generally, were expanded in the direction of an increased control over the economic life of the nation. The period from 1889 to 1913, while the department was under the secretaryship of James Wilson, is thus characterized as one of pluralism, during which the departmental activities were increased by various new regulatory and research and informational functions. When the full implications of the passing of the frontier, and of the increasing interdependence

of our economic system with world factors became apparent, the department became increasingly concerned with planning for the whole of the agricultural economy of the nation. Two chapters are thus devoted to the policy and efforts at integration from 1913 to 1929.

In the second part of the study, the organic or substantive functions of the department are subjected to a cross-sectional analysis. These functions are defined rather arbitrarily as those relating to production, to land use, to marketing and distribution, to rural life, and to finance. In analyzing the activities resulting from the performance of each of these functions, it is emphasized "that many lines of interrelationship exist among the departmental agencies to which these activities are entrusted (lines which may be thought of as horizontal on the typical organization chart) and also between the Department at Washington, its own field units, and state agencies (lines which may be thought of as vertical)." Thus, by way of illustration, the administrative aspects of activities relating to the production of plants and animals are brought together in a single chapter, though they are performed by several bureaus, or line agencies of the department. The historical origins of such activities are traced briefly, but the main emphasis is placed on the development of policies and procedures, which have been developed in recent years to cope with the problems presented by post-World War developments.

In the third part of the study, the organization by which the activities of the line agencies are co-ordinated and controlled is described. "Function," the authors indicate, "is the subject matter of an organism; organization is its structure. They are inseparable. An organism is composed of parts co-ordinated for the accomplishment of a given objective; organization provides the co-ordination." This organization in the Department of Agriculture is found in a general staff, whose structure is elaborate and extensive, and includes the "Under Secretary, Assistant Secretary, Secretariat, auxiliary and line members, special advisers, committees, boards, and a whole bureau." The organization, moreover, includes a number of "auxiliary services," whose objective is to facilitate the operation of line agencies, and on occasion "advise the department head in the formulation of department policies."

Since the authors disclaim any intention of presenting "a comprehensive definitive description of the Department," it is not to be expected that their study will contain a clear-cut exposition of the administrative developments which resulted in the present organization of the Department of Agriculture. The section on the evolution of the department is thus intended merely to provide background material for an understanding of the way in which the department performs its main function, or how it discharges "its public responsibility for production, marketing, and financing of farm commodities and their influence on land use and rural life." This section is therefore incomplete in detail, and perhaps inaccurate in the general impression it creates. For, in the period of its youth, from 1862 to 1889, which receives

attention in a scant twelve pages, the department sowed its wild oats—its funds were mainly used for distributing seeds—and only gradually did its work receive a scientific emphasis. Since more attention is given to the department's activities after it had "come of age," quite new and valuable information is presented on developments in the field of agricultural economics. In the section on the organic functions of the department, the major administrative policies formulated to cope with post-World War developments in production, land use, marketing and distribution, rural life, and finance are emphasized. Since this was "a time of great confusion," the administrative developments are also very confused, but the impression of the intricacies of the "many lines of interrelationship" in the various bureaus performing these over-all functions is even heightened by the complex manner in which the material is organized. Perhaps an exposition of the administrative changes made during "the process of growth, adjustments and accommodations" would have resulted in a clear picture of the organization by means of which the department accomplished its functions. As it is, an organism is dissected to determine the function of its members, but without much regard being taken for its skeleton. It is perhaps better, however, to have meat without bones, than bones without meat. For the archivist, who is interested in tracing the administrative origins of various functions, which resulted in the creation of various archival groups, this section provides little asssitance. The third section, devoted to an analysis of the general staff of the department and of its auxiliary services, lacks definiteness in its delineation of organization. In general, the study should accomplish its first objective, namely that of stimulating researches in administration, for it serves to illustrate the need of basic studies in the administrative history of the department, which could be utilized to make a synthesis of "tendencies and adjustments over a period of years," such as is attempted by the authors.

The appendix, containing a description of "Budgetary Administration in the Department of Agriculture" by Verne B. Lewis is an important contribution to the field of budgeting.

Theodore R. Schellenberg

The National Archives

Notes on the Care and Cataloguing of Old Maps, by Lloyd A. Brown. (Windham, Conn. Hawthorn House, 1940. Pp. 110.)

In the belief that a few guiding principles on the care and cataloguing of maps are of greater help than a multitude of rules, the curator of maps in the William L. Clements Library has essayed such a guide in this small but pleasing volume. It is a practical little handbook which, by virtue of its simplicity and common sense, should do its bit to fill, partly at least, a gap of long standing. It would be of particular value as a guide to the handling of maps in a general library.

The larger part of the work is devoted to a discussion of map cataloguing; the remainder is divided into four almost equal sections containing an extremely brief résumé of the history of cartography and discussions of problems of storage and equipment, possible methods of classification, and cartographic nomenclature. There is also a selected bibliography.

The observations and recommendations are based largely on the practices followed in the Clements Library and thus relate chiefly to material published between 1500 and 1800. A wide latitude in cataloguing is suggested by the author's belief that "some cataloguers will choose to stress bibliographic data such as printers, publishers, delineators and engravers, while others will consider geographic data such as scale, projection and prime meridia of foremost importance." Some examples are given, and several reproductions of catalogue cards are included. There are brief notes on map cases, their size and construction, and on the filing of maps and interesting observations on map folders, with useful hints on paper to use and paper to avoid, and on labeling and mounting. Fortunately a regional classification of material is advised, with the possible exception of archival material of the type in the National Archives, where maps originally accompanied documents and where the material will be used primarily in conjunction with those documents. In the section on nomenclature an effort is made to define, and to clarify the use of, the terms "impression," "state," "issue," and "editions."

It may be noted that the volume is the product of Hawthorn House which has already entered the field of cartographic bibliography with its "Maps of Connecticut before the Year 1800" and which deserves encouragement in developing such a publication program.

ELIZABETH T. PLATT

The American Geographical Society

Functional File Classification, a Plan of Filing Correspondence and Other Papers According to the Functions, Tasks, or Activities of the Business, Originally Prepared for Montana State University, by J. B. Speer. (Missoula, Montana. Student Store, Montana State University, August, 1940. Pp. 75. Mimeographed.)

This classification plan for filing records was begun in 1917-1918 by the author when secretary to the president of the University of Montana, and seemingly covers all the records of the university. The various sections of the scheme are envisioned as the province of particular officers to eliminate duplication in filing and the necessity of central files by defining the functions of the units of organization. The nine principal functions of all business, as outlined by Professor Speer, are administration, which covers all other functions, public relations, finance, staff personnel, physical plant, and procurement, which are service functions, and supply, production, and distribution which are steps in the process of business. Obviously in many organizations officers

to match some of these functions are lacking, and combinations and cross combinations are multitudinous in their variety, while questions of personality prevent a rigid allotment of duties and necessitate constant change and growth. In a university, as Professor Speer points out, there rarely is a public relations officer except for the specialized alumni secretary or a distribution officer except for an occasional placement secretary, while the deans are responsible in part for the students which are the "supply," and in part for the instruction which is the "production" of a university. The Dewey Decimal System for classifying books has often proved unbalanced when used in other than the small public library, and Professor Speer's proposed system will also be unbalanced unless it is modified to meet the specialization of the institution which it is to serve. Its importance is its suggestiveness, not its universality, for differences between businesses are more fundamental than I think Professor Speer admits. Change in a business is constant so that any functional file scheme to reflect the functional history should be planned to grow with the institution as has the Library of Congress subject classification scheme for books. The scheme however should be subject to periodic pruning which is not the case in the Library of Congress where the basic simplicity is now lost under detail.

A classification scheme which covers all records, as does Professor Speer's, does not lend itself to scientific weeding out of files, and to the segregation of case and financial files which will be needed for legal purposes within the statute of limitations, policy files which should be saved for the historian and his brother social scientists, and routine files which involve no problems but can be disposed of as soon as closed. In a sense, Professor Speer has made such disposition impossible for he has mingled subjects and types of records. We find the student's permanent record cards classed (612.1) next to mixed files of policy, case and routine papers concerned with procedures (611.1), classes (611.2), and the assessment of fees (611.3). If whole sections of the scheme were subject to periodic destruction, it seems to me that the disproportion resulting would be misleading. Professor Speer's scheme is directly applicable to the policy files and should be confined to that group. Financial, accounting, case, and routine files are of such bulk and uniformity that it does not seem necessary to add the same number to file case after file case, while disposition will be much easier.

Professor Speer needs to suggest in his introduction the necessity for the chronological breaking or retirement of files so that his system will be economical. Refiling, pulling, and interfiling records is an expensive process and should be avoided, while constant interfiling is also a menace to the physical well being of records as they age. To cover any consequent inconvenience, and to bring out the unusual in the files an over-all index is needed, for no filing system will bring together all the records about a given subject or person, and often some subjects are completely lost. Greater reliance can be placed upon a many-sided index than upon a one-sided classification scheme.

Also for any decimal system such as Professor Speer's an index is needed for the scheme itself, similar to that which he has provided, and there must be constant vigilance to check subjective interpretation of phraseology. The same system used in many file rooms will be variously applied, and through the years the same system will be variously interpreted even by one person. Above all, simplicity not complexity is the desideratum to be maintained in a filing system.

DAVID C. DUNIWAY

The National Archives

Preliminary Inventory of the War Industries Board Records. Preliminary Inventory of the National Archives, No. 1. (Washington. The National Archives, 1941. Pp. xvii, 134. Mimeographed, paper binding.)

In the current national emergency it would seem that we might profit from a study of the various agencies which the government set up during the similar period of the World War—how those agencies were organized, how they functioned, and what they accomplished or failed to accomplish. Such a study might be particularly useful in showing us how to avoid some of the mistakes which were made before. The inventory of the records of the War Industries Board is timely, therefore, for it covers the records of one of the most important of the mushroom agencies of 1917-1918. The War Industries Board was created by the Council of National Defense "to act as a clearing house for the war industry needs of the Government." It "analyzed the industrial requirements of the Nation and of the Allies and the extent to which they could be met; issued 'clearances' on Government orders before they were placed with contractors; determined priorities in the production and delivery of commodities; arranged agreements fixing the prices of certain raw materials; encouraged the conservation of existing facilities and resources and when necessary developed new ones; and supervised the purchasing of the Allies in the United States." In other words, the board faced and dealt with many of the same problems with which we are confronted today, so that a knowledge of its workings and achievements would be very pertinent for us at the present time.

The story of what happened to these records since the dissolution of the board in December, 1918, points forcibly to the need for the expert care of archives. In 1919 most of the records were placed in the custody of the Council of National Defense; in 1921 they were transferred to the War Department, where some of them were redistributed in "consolidated files"; and in 1931 they were turned over to the National Archives. Certain of the records, however, yet remain with other agencies where they were placed soon after 1918. Having received the main body of these materials, the National Archives undertook to restore them as nearly as possible to their original order, and as a result of this work a large part of them are now "arranged first

by divisions or comparable units of the Board, within divisions by sections, within sections by groups of documents of a similar character, and within groups by series." It has not been practicable, however, to extract a considerable portion of the papers from the "consolidated files," where their original arrangement is not shown and where "material on closely related subjects is scattered in a great many places in the files." An over-zealous filing clerk, it seems, without knowledge of accepted practices of archival classification and arrangement and using merely her own improvised system, has succeeded in impairing seriously and perhaps irreparably the value of an unusually significant body of records.

The present preliminary inventory (which has been produced under the pressure of emergency needs and therefore "is not to be considered as typical of preliminary inventories to be issued in the future") is the first publication under a program launched by the National Archives in February, 1941, according to which each major body of archival material will be listed as follows: first by a checklist, which "will list the series, files, volumes, or other units of material approximately as they are found without waiting for final arrangement"; next by a preliminary inventory, which will be processed and made available for general use; and eventually, after the reclassification and rearrangement of the material have been completed, by a final inventory. This program will be welcomed by all who use the archives, for it will undoubtedly facilitate the use of the materials therein.

C. C. Crittenden

The North Carolina Historical Commission

A Calendar of the White Collection of Manuscripts in the Public Archives of Nova Scotia, compiled by Margaret Ells under the direction of D. C. Harvey, archivist. Public Archives of Nova Scotia, *Publications,* No. 5. (Halifax. 1940. Pp. xi, 130. $1.00.)

Calendar of the Stevens Family Papers. Preliminary volume prepared by the New Jersey Historical Records Survey Project, Work Projects Administration, from the collection in the Lieb Memorial Library, Stevens Institute of Technology. (Newark. 1940. Pp. 111.)

The documents of neither of these two volumes can be considered archives in the commonly accepted sense, though one book is published by the public archives of a province of Canada and the other by a state survey of historical records under WPA auspices. Each consists of résumés of selected documents from a collection of important family papers. Public interest is so well served by both publications that no one will cavil at spending government funds for making the collections better known to the public.

The White manuscripts begin with the American Revolution and end for practical purposes about 1900. They consist of the papers of an American loyalist, Capt. Gideon White, who settled in Nova Scotia, and his descendants.

The calendaring is uneven. Many documents are summarized merely as "personal and business." Other résumés quote the originals *in extenso*, probably reflecting the calendarer's personal interest in the papers. Trade with the West Indies and the United States, loyalists and their activities and sentiments, land transactions, the early settlement of certain Nova Scotia towns, legislation, patronage, prices, railways, and family matters are the general topics treated in the papers.

The calendar of the Stevens family papers is a preliminary book in a series of several volumes. It is highly selective, aiming merely to inform the reader of the type of useful and important data to be found in the collection. This is obviously a unique and tremendously important body of papers, for it is practically a history of transportation inventions and improvements in the United States from 1788 to the end of the Civil War. James Rumsey, DeWitt Clinton, John Fitch, Robert Fulton, Robert R. Livingston, Nicholas Roosevelt and many others write to Stevens and he to them on steamboats and boilers and their possibilities, bridges, horse boats, roads, railroads, tunnels under rivers, and Stevens' "machinery" of 1798 "based on the principal [*sic*] of a piston working in a cylinder put in motion by the explosion of an inflammable gas reacted upon by pressure of elasticity of air in the cylinder." Many other important persons, events, and topics enter into the discussions carried on by the correspondence of John Stevens and his son of the same name.

Grace Lee Nute

Minnesota Historical Society

Der Archivar, von Heinrich Otto Meisner. Herausgegeben vom Akademischen Auskunftsamt Berlin in Verbindung mit dem Amt für Berufserziehung u. Betriebsführung in der Deutschen Arbeitsfront. (Berlin. 1938. Pp. 22. RM .50.)

The author of this little study, an *Oberarchivrat* and division chief in the Reichsarchiv in Potsdam, some time ago published a handbook for the use of searchers in modern archives (reviewed in THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST, II (October, 1939), 264-165). In the present publication he sets forth the steps by which a man becomes an archivist in Germany, tells how much he is paid, and concludes by predicting a rosy future for the profession under the Nazi regime. Dr. Meisner is plainly no enemy to National Socialism.

The most interesting part of the pamphlet is the first section which deals with general archival problems. The author distinguishes between three types of archives—the genuine, the pseudo, and the intermediate. The genuine archival establishment has three characteristics. In the first place, it contains records created by a government agency, a foundation or corporation, a family or a person. Such records represent an organic whole. The second characteristic is the originality of its documents. Finally, the genuine archival establishment has the characteristic of limitlessness or universality as regards

the subjects treated in its records. Of course, some differences in this respect exist between state and private establishments.

Dr. Meisner makes short shrift of the other two types of archives. The pseudo type, such as the Archiv für Volksbildung, lacks all three of the marks of the genuine archival establishment. It is an artificial creation containing perhaps newspaper clippings and pamphlets, collected for a specific, limited purpose. The intermediate type of archival establishment is found in collections of private papers. The Literaturarchiv in Berlin exemplifies this type. It contains manuscripts and letters of German writers, but these papers are selected, not complete.

These distinctions made, the author discusses in masterly fashion the functions of a trained archivist in a state establishment. Above all, the archivist is the guardian of the historical heritage of a people in so far as this rests on the written residue of its political organs. Apart from this custodial duty, Dr. Meisner considers the preparing of finding mediums as one of the most important functions of the archivist, for without these the records are unusable. If the finding mediums are well prepared, they will outlive their authors for centuries. The Preussisches Geheimes Staatsarchiv, for example, is still using the finding books which were prepared in the time of the Great Elector.

Another function of the archivist is to publish collections of documents. His familiarity with the records makes him peculiarly fitted for this work, and many archivists have devoted themselves to it in the past two centuries. From publication of sources to writing is but a step. Thus professional archival workers have produced many important historical works. A number have become in consequence university professors, a result which Dr. Meisner seems to view with equanimity.

But not all the functions of the archivist are positive. Among his negative obligations is that of seeing to it that his establishment does not become stuffed with worthless papers. He must determine what records will be valuable in the future and reject those of no value. Decisions of this character, as Dr. Meisner properly points out, should be based on a thorough historical knowledge as well as an insight into the workings of the government agencies. Every official or archivist who has ordered the destruction of so-called "useless papers," should read with wholesome fear and trembling the author's dictum that the most able archivist is not infallible in making these decisions.

By way of preparation, the archivist must start out with a love of history. He must know the past of his state and people in order to understand the documents. He must also possess a sense of order, a searching instinct (*Spürsinn*), scientific exactitude and patience. He must tread many paths in vain without yielding to fatigue. He must be ready to help searchers and place himself in the world of their wishes and interests in order better to guide them. He selects and arranges the documents only to offer them to others. Yet he

takes while he gives. From the close contact with the sources springs the spark of "professional joy."

So much for the general introduction. Under Section II Dr. Meisner discusses the three steps by which a man becomes an archivist in Germany. First of all, there is the general preparation. This varies from region to region. For admission to the Prussian Institut für Archivwissenschaft und geschichtswissenschaftliche Fortbildung in Berlin-Dahlem, for example, one must give evidence of having studied medieval and modern history and allied subjects at a university, of having written a Ph.D. dissertation on a historical theme, and of having passed an examination for teaching in the higher schools.

In regard to preliminary archival training, the second step, this may be obtained in four places—in the Institut in Berlin-Dahlem mentioned above, in the Österreichisches Institut für Geschichtsforschung in Vienna, in the Hauptstaatsarchiv in Munich, and in the Staatsarchiv in Weimar. The period of training varies from one and one-half years to three years. Part of the time is devoted to actual archival work.

The final step is the archival examination. This is both written and oral. In Berlin-Dahlem the written examinations last fourteen hours, the oral four hours. If he passes, the candidate may now enter the archival service. In Prussia he receives the title of *Archivassessor*. After several years of service, he is eligible to be named to regular official rank.

Under Section IV of his study, Dr. Meisner provides a number of details in regard to the salary scales as applied to members of the archival profession. Space is lacking to reproduce these details here. Suffice it to say that in Germany an archivist is paid in accordance with his conjugal status. A married man receives more than his unmarried colleague, and additional compensation is allowed if he has children.

It is to be hoped that some day Dr. Meisner will expand his subject into a larger work. Theory is excellent but its value needs to be proved by practical demonstration. Dr. Meisner recognizes, for instance, that the modern archivist should not and indeed cannot preserve all the records produced. One would like some examples of documents he regards as worthless. And what kind of modern documents would he select for publication? Is it possible these days to view such publication in the same light as did the archivist of a century or two centuries ago? Would Dr. Meisner regard microfilming as a fitting substitute for the printing of documents?

To what extent can the archivist devote himself to personal research? Dr. Meisner gives us no light on this score. He tells how we arrange documentary material only to place it at the disposal of others. *Nos, non pro nobis!* At the same time he mentions historical writing by archivists as if this were as possible as it ever was. But is it? Miss Norton has declared that the modern archivist, hard pressed with a thousand duties, has no time for historical research and writing. In her words: "Archival work is administrative work."

The American reader can hardly fail to be struck by the course of training prescribed for prospective archivists in Germany and to reflect on the need of an institution in this country prepared to give similar instruction, adapted, naturally, to our own national background. As regards compensation for archival work, it is doubtful whether anyone could be found here who would openly advocate introducing the German system of salary discrimination between married and unmarried archivists. We still prefer not to consider the conjugal status in arranging our salary scales.

CARL LUDWIG LOKKE
The National Archives

"Archives and Libraries, a Comparison Drawn," by Margaret C. Norton. *Blue Book of the State of Illinois, 1939-1940,* edited by Edward J. Hughes, secretary of state, pp. 427-443. (Printed by authority of the State of Illinois. N. p., n. d.)

Within a brief space Miss Norton has touched on many subjects of interest to the archivist. In general no great aid is seen given to the archivist by librarians. The difference in classification and cataloguing as practiced by librarians and archivists is brought out, and Miss Norton draws examples from her experience in Illinois to give point to her argument. In line with the Society of American Archivists' committee on the subject, Miss Norton does not feel that library training is suitable for an archivist. Yet librarians have much to offer archivists. Miss Norton notes that the principles of library card cataloguing are being adopted by American archivists. Thus persons familiar with the library catalogue can use an archival catalogue. However, here in itself is an argument for some sort of library training for the archivist. Assuming that the form of entry is different, the basic technique of making up the catalogue card can not be learned in a casual fashion. Nor should archivists lose sight of the fact that librarians' methods of handling serials might well be utilized by archivists in connection with open series. The careful work done by librarians on government documents is another field in which archivists might place close study. Librarians are aware of the agency of origin in classing this type of material and government documents are by no means catalogued exclusively from the subject angle. The filing of printed government documents as practiced in Illinois (other than material originally so filed) with manuscript materials is highly questionable. Not only are official documents so filed in Illinois but also material which may have been privately printed. Thus reprints of original material are "catalogued and classified with the originals." This not only is bad archival practice, but also is a useless duplication of effort. Such material is already admirably catalogued by librarians and there is no need to spread a duplicate set in the archival stacks. In so far as possible an archival agency should have on its reference shelves a complete government document set, but these should merely be used as reference tools.

One great advantage of having the archival agency as a part of a state library is to direct the users of printed material to the library division.

On the matter of archival classification, Miss Norton, in line with most archivists, adheres to the principle of *provenance* or *respect des fonds*. These magical words have kept archivists in a theoretical dither and do not solve any more problems than does the repeating of the words "supply and demand" answer all economic questions. As a matter of stern reality there are few institutions that can really completely observe the principle of *provenance*. Most institutions have well established subject groups which were made up out of necessity. Thus in the older states we almost uniformly find a group of Revolutionary records drawn together from a number of so-called fonds. Even if this material could be worked back into its original legislative, executive, or other groups, it would be futile to do this. The fact is, the public is more interested in getting the information desired promptly, rather than being forced to have a comprehensive knowledge of administrative history in order to know how to manipulate the card catalogue. Classification should be functional and simple; not theoretical and complex.

WILLIAM J. VAN SCHREEVEN

Virginia State Library

SHORTER NOTICES

EMMETT J. LEAHY, Editor
Box 6154, Washington, D.C.

The inclusiveness and the logical and clear arrangement of Anne Morris Boyd's *United States Government Publications; Sources of Information for Libraries* (New York. The H. W. Wilson Company, 1941. Pp. 548.) makes it an efficient and easy-to-use guide to the publications of the United States government. The documents are grouped by source of issue and fall into four main divisions: publications of Congress, of the courts, of the executive departments, and of independent agencies. A detailed index makes other approaches readily possible.

The book is much more than a check list. In addition to descriptive notes which indicate the nature and content of the documents, it presents a clear exposition of the complicated and somewhat esoteric subject of government publication, including, for example, chapters on the nature of such publications, their printing and distribution, and on relevant indexes and catalogues. The chapter on Congressional publications gives an excellent account of legislative procedures. Bibliographies are given at the end of each chapter, and organization charts are included.

For archival workers, the brief sketches of the administrative history of the various departments, bureaus, and agencies should particularly be noted. According to the title page, this book is revised to June 1, 1940, but by means of notes the administrative histories are brought up to date beyond that period. Although these histories make no effort to present exhaustive accounts of functional and organizational mutations, they have their value. They serve to place the governmental unit in time and function, and frequently that is all that is desired. In the present undeveloped state of writings on the administrative history of the government, it is something to have that much information about so many units presented conveniently in one authoritative source.—BESS GLENN

The fourth installment of "Papers from the Spanish archives relating to Tennessee and the Old Southwest, 1783-1800," edited by D. C. Corbitt and Roberta Corbitt, appears in the East Tennessee Historical Society's *Publications,* No. 12 (1940), 100-117. One of the documents here presented is the cover letter with which Governor Estevan Miró and Intendant Martín Navarro forwarded and endorsed James Wilkinson's first memorial to the Spanish court. The rest are letters to and from various Spanish officials in Louisiana and West Florida. They fall in the last four months of 1787 and principally concern the steps that Spain was taking to stiffen Indian resistance

against American encroachments on the Cumberland and Georgia frontiers. A letter from Alexander McGillivray to Miró, reproduced from a mutilated manuscript, is incorrectly dated December, 1787. A signed duplicate in the East Florida Papers at the Library of Congress and printed in *McGillivray of the Creeks* (Norman, Okla., 1938), 75-77, furnishes the proper date as October 4, 1787, and would have spared the editors many bracketed attempts to fill in missing words and phrases. In a few sentences the meaning has been lost. In conjunction with the related documents which Mr. Corbitt has been publishing in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* and the *Georgia Historical Quarterly*, this sheaf of letters represents a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the Old Southwest.—JOHN WALTON CAUGHEY

The interest of Sra. Ignez Correia d'Araujo in archivology led her to make a detailed study of the National Archives. After her return to Brazil she presented her observations at a conference for the staff of Serviços Hollerith. The pamphlet, in Portuguese, *O Arquivo Nacional dos Estados Unidos* (Rio de Janeiro. Instituto de Mecanização, 1940), contains the most extensive account of the archives which has been written in a foreign language. A brief outline of the history of the movement for a national archives is followed by a description of the building. The organization of the staff, as well as the functions and methods employed in the work, are considered. There are many references to persons who assisted the author in securing information. Statements are made regarding each of the administrative and professional divisions of the organization. Particular attention is given to the Divisions of Classification and Cataloguing which have recently been abolished. Their importance is emphasized and their processes and production are pointed out as models of excellence.

In conclusion, Sra. d'Araujo pays high compliment to the first archivist of the United States and his work. The pamphlet has numerous illustrations.—ROSCOE R. HILL

Control of Federal Expenditures, A Documentary History, 1775-1894, compiled by Fred Wilbur Powell (Washington. The Brookings Institution, 1939. Pp. 928. $5.00) is a collection of excerpts from the records of Congressional debates, United States documents and papers of eminent statesmen which gives a history of the accounting system of the Revolutionary government, the Confederation, and the republic from the convening of the Second Continental Congress through the changes brought about in December, 1894, as a result of the Dockery-Cockrell investigation. By its very nature, it lacks coherence, but that could have been remedied by tying the various excerpts together by explanatory paragraphs. The seventy-five groups of illustrative documents are taken from the *Journals* of the Continental Congress, the *American State Papers*, the several records of the debates of Congress, the

serial set of government documents, and the printed collections of the papers of such statesmen as Alexander Hamilton and Daniel Webster. Its chief value for archivists, is that it brings together in small compass many of the pertinent documents for the administrative history of the Department of the Treasury, but even that is lessened if one is close to a large library, where the documents mentioned, together with many more similar ones, are usually easy of access.—EDWARD F. ROWSE

Most of the details in Solon J. Buck's article, "The Living Past," *Pennsylvania History*, VIII (January, 1941), 47-58 will be known to students who read this periodical. Particularly to them do I recommend it, for Dr. Buck has again justified his reputation as the most comprehensive, enlightened, logical, and methodical American synthesizer on documentary subjects. It is so skillfully done as to be creative. The meaning of the past, the meaning of records, the problem of documentation, steps taken to solve it, and the phases of archives, their reproduction and control, now a concern of scholars in the United States, are succinctly stated. Possibly some who read the article will think the problems of reproduction and control are practically solved. This is no fault of Dr. Buck's but of the exigency of space. His last paragraph on the relation of documentation to advance of civilization is stimulating.

It is good that juxtaposition enables one to turn to the next article, "Pennsylvania and her Archives," pp. 59-64, by Messrs. E. M. Braderman and B. S. Levin, whose intention is to arouse sentiment among historically minded Pennsylvania citizens for a central archives building. Here, indeed, is a problem of control pitifully crying for solution. Anyone who has studied the situation at first hand knows that the critical condition of the mass of state archives outside the Archives Division is justly described. They contend that this division, under the state library, does not house all the important series for the Provincial and Revolutionary period, includes only a portion from 1790 to 1838, and has only the sheerest fragment of the past century's records. All this is true. Many of their strictures on the Archives Division are pointless. The same criticism of method, due to lack of archival knowledge, could be raised in many states. It is not true that the archives were formerly considered primarily as museum pieces. Guidance was sought from the Library of Congress in the early 1900's and the late Dr. Ames and others were prominent in this work. But it is true that only an independent central archives and archivist with a council will save the records from further destruction. There must be action quickly. It is a pity that the article did not appeal also to lawyers, business men, and all social science students.—CURTIS W. GARRISON

NEWS NOTES

Karl L. Trever, Editor
Box 6154, Washington, D.C.

The Society of American Archivists

The Society's fifth annual meeting, which will be held at Hartford, Conn., October 6 and 7, is its second gathering in New England, the organization meeting having been held at Providence, R.I., December 29, 1936. In the intervening period the Society has achieved recognition as a leading organization in the promotion of co-operation and exchange of ideas among archivists and historical manuscript custodians throughout the country. Its membership and subscription lists have more than doubled and cover nearly all states and all continents. At the Hartford meeting a major topic will be the role of the archivist in times of emergency. Full reports of the business and discussion sessions will be published in the January issue of THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST.

The National Archives

R. D. W. Connor, first archivist of the United States, resigned from that position effective September 15, 1941, to occupy a newly created chair of American history and jurisprudence at the University of North Carolina. Dr. Connor carries with him the respect and admiration of the staff of the National Archives, of the academic world, and of government officials for his achievements since his appointment in October, 1934. During that period the construction of the National Archives building has been completed, a diversified staff including experts in many fields has been recruited and organized, working relationships have been established with most of the important government agencies regarding current record administration, records have been accessioned representing nearly all the significant agencies, the holdings have been described and made available to searchers, and a great deal of valuable government investigation and private research has been performed upon them. Complete statements of accomplishments and resources are available in the first six and the forthcoming seventh *Annual Reports of the Archivist of the United States* (Washington, 1936-1941) and in the *Guide to Materials in the National Archives* (Washington, 1940).

In accepting the resignation the President of the United States made public the following letter:

Dear Doctor Connor:

I hate the thought of losing your splendid services as Archivist of the United States, but I can well appreciate the pull that the Chair of the University of North Carolina makes on your heartstrings.

As the first Archivist of the United States, you have not only laid the foundation but have built the actual structure of an extremely important and permanent repository of American historical source material. Your record is one which will always be acclaimed with well-deserved appreciation.

I hope very much that you can remain in charge of the National Archives until, at least, the fifteenth of September. Please let me know when you want me to set the date of your official resignation. I am doing this not only with official regret, but with my own deep regret that I shall lose a personal friend from my official family.

Always sincerely
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

The President sent to the Senate on September 15, 1941, the nomination of Dr. Solon J. Buck as second archivist of the United States. The nomination was confirmed by the Senate on September 18. Dr. Buck has served as director of publications, more recently research and publications, in the National Archives, since 1935. Previous to that he was for some years research associate in history at the University of Illinois, then superintendant of the Minnesota Historical Society, later director of the Western Pennsylvania Historical Society, and on the faculties of the University of Minnesota, University of Pittsburgh, and other institutions. He was chairman of the organizing committee of the Society of American Archivists, and served as a member of its council for three years.

A National Archives Trust Fund Board, with authority to accept and administer gifts or bequests of money, securities, and other personal property "for the benefit of or in connection with The National Archives, it collections, or its services" was established by an act of Congress approved July 9, 1941. The board consists of the archivist of the United States, as chairman, and the chairman of the Senate and House Library committees.

The demands of the national emergency for office space and for better servicing of noncurrent Federal records are in large part responsible for several transfers, recently completed or in progress, of large bodies of material to the National Archives. Among these are the main body of records of the Office of the Quartermaster General through 1914, most of the noncurrent records of the Office of the Chief of Ordnance, the general correspondence files of the Navy Department's Bureau of Navigation through 1924 and of its Bureau of Supplies and Accounts through 1939, and the administrative correspondence and case files of the General Land Office through 1908. Other recent transfers of special interest include twenty-one volumes of correspondence, reports, essays, and other papers, 1839-1860, of the former Agricultural Division of the Patent Office, the predecessor of the Department of Agriculture; field notes, maps and profiles, and other records of the Intercontinental Railway

Commission, which conducted surveys in Central and South America in the nineties; records of the Committee on Economic Security, 1934-1935; and records of the Temporary National Economic Committee, 1938-1941.

The first of the inventories of material in the National Archives to be issued since the initiation of the new finding-mediums program is entitled *Preliminary Inventory of the War Industries Board Records* (xvii, 134pp.). Other new processed professional documents include bibliographies on the arrangement and description of archival material (7pp.) and on the conservation of cultural resources in times of war (9pp.), and *Staff Information Circular,* No. 11, entitled "The Role of Records in Administration," which consists of discussions on German administration, by Ernst Posner, on American federal government administration, by Helen L. Chatfield, and on American business administration, by Edna B. Poeppel. Copies of any of these documents are available upon request, as long as the supply lasts, and a mailing list for future issues of the *Staff Information Circulars* is being established.

The Franklin D. Roosevelt Library

The Franklin D. Roosevelt Library was formally dedicated to the service of the nation by the President of the United States at Hyde Park on June 30. Frank C. Walker, postmaster general of the United States, presided, and President Roosevelt's dedicatory remarks were preceded by short addresses by R. D. W. Connor, archivist of the United States, and Samuel E. Morison, professor of history at Harvard University.

The President announced the appointment of Basil O'Connor, Frank C. Walker, Harry L. Hopkins, and Samuel E. Morison as members of the Board of Trustees, which is authorized by law to accept gifts and bequests of personal property and to hold and administer them and the fees collected from visitors to the exhibition rooms as trust funds for the benefit of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library. The archivist of the United States serves as chairman of the board, the secretary of the treasury is also a member ex-officio, and one member is still to be appointed. The museum portions of the library were opened to the public after the dedication exercises and within three weeks over six thousand visitors had paid the admission fee of twenty-five cents. No fees will be charged for the use of the library proper when it is opened.

Material recently received by the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library from the President includes stenographic reports of his press conferences from 1933 to 1940, a collection of pamphlets and other printed material pertaining chiefly to the United States Navy in the nineteenth century, and additional files of presidential papers.

Dr. John S. Curtiss, formerly an area project supervisor of the Historical Records Survey in New York and an instructor in history in several municipal colleges in New York City, has been appointed as assistant archivist at the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.

A six-page illustrated circular describing the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library has recently been published as National Archives *Circular* No. 5; copies can be obtained from the library or from the administrative secretary of the National Archives.

Library of Congress

Henry B. Dillard, formerly of the Historical Records Survey, has been appointed assistant in the Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress. Miss Elizabeth G. McPherson has been promoted from work in connection with the Wilbur Fund to the regular staff of the Manuscripts Division.

Among the recent accessions of the Manuscripts Division of the library are copies of early county archives and church minutes prepared by the Historical Records Survey. Carbon copies of typewritten transcripts of commissioners' records have been received for the state of Indiana as follows: Daviess County, 1817-1820; Jefferson County, 1822-1838; Lake County, 1837-1848; Orange County, 1829-1845; Posey County, 1820-1829; Vigo County, 1829-1837, 1844-1858, 1864-1867, and 1875-1878. Similar copies of Tennessee court minutes have been received for the following counties: Blount County, 1818; Bradley County, 1838-1841; Carter County, 1821-1826; Greene County, 1826-1827; Madison County, 1840-1848; Meigs County, 1841-1846; Montgomery County, 1820-1821; Putnam County, 1842-1856; Rutherford County, 1827-1830; Washington County, 1791-1799; Wilson County, 1809-1819. In addition, there are included minutes of the Ocoee Baptist Association of Tennessee, 1859-1896, and transcripts of Spanish Minute Books I and II, and Journal A of the records of the city of San Antonio, Texas, covering the period 1815-1835 and 1837-1849.

Work Projects Administration

Historical Records Survey Projects, during the months of May, June, and July, 1941, published 119 volumes as follows: 33 county archives inventories, 7 town and municipal archives inventories, 4 inventories of the records of the state departments and 35 of federal agencies, 1 check list of early American imprints, 20 inventories of church records and directories of religious bodies, 6 guides to vital statistics records, and 9 miscellaneous publications, chiefly transcriptions of manuscript collections and archival series. Of special interest are the guides to the manuscript collections of the Pennsylvania Historical Society and the University of North Carolina printed by the respective institutions. The total number of Historical Records Survey publications at the end of July was 1,392.

Don Farran has been appointed to the central office staff of the Historical Records Survey, succeeding Dr. George M. McFarland, whose resignation was announced in the July number of THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST. Mr. Farran was formerly state director of the Historical Records Survey in

Iowa, regional director of the National Service Bureau of the Federal Theater Project of the Work Projects Administration, and a member of the central editorial staff of the American Imprints Inventory.

General News

The American Association for State and Local History will hold its first annual meeting at Hartford, Conn., October 8, 1941. A joint session will be held with the Society of American Archivists the preceding evening. A steady increase was noted in the membership, which by September 1 exceeded 175 individuals and 90 institutions. David L. Darden, of the Alabama Department of Archives and History, has succeeded James W. Moffitt as chairman of the membership committee.

The association's first publication, the *State and Local History News*, Vol. 1, No. 1, appeared in July, with Bess Glenn as editor and Thomas Mayock as assistant editor. It is to be published bi-monthly and contains news of the association and of local historical activities, announcements, reports of meetings, and lists of new members. The *State and Local History News* will be distributed to all members, and non-members may obtain it on subscription at one dollar a year. An editorial board has been chosen to serve all the publications under the direction of C. C. Crittenden, the general editor. It consists of Solon J. Buck, John W. Caughey, Bertha Josephson, and a Canadian member yet to be named. The general editor has immediate supervision over the *Bulletin* series, of which the first issue will be "What Should Our Historical Society Do," by Edward P. Alexander. Inquiries concerning the association and its publications should be addressed to the secretary, David C. Duniway, Box 6101, Washington, D.C.

The Committee on the British Sessional Papers, a special committee of the Committee on Historical Source Materials of the American Historical Association has made an agreement with the Readex Microprint Corporation to issue a microprint edition of the nineteenth-century volumes of the British House of Commons *Sessional Papers*. This agreement has been officially endorsed by the executive committee of the American Historical Association.

In return for twenty-five pledged full-subscriptions, or their equivalent, the Readex company will supply each subscriber with a microprint edition of the nineteenth-century volumes at the price of $5,000, which, it is estimated, is about one-half that at which the collection could be supplied in microfilm. Upwards of 5,800 volumes or about 4,000,000 pages compose the nineteenth-century portion of this collection.

The collating and editing preparatory to the microcopying of the materials will be done by the committee so as to insure completeness of text and adequacy of arrangement. The Readex company guarantees its microprints for fifty years and claims that they will be serviceable for more than a

hundred years. This guarantee and this claim have been substantiated by the results of tests made of microprint specimens by the National Bureau of Standards.

A large part of the collection is available for microcopying in several different libraries in the United States and Canada, but some of the *Papers* will have to be microcopied in England.

It is hoped that the project can be completed in from five to ten years. The plan is to issue the first thirty years, estimated at 536 volumes, by June of 1942. The chairman of the special committee is Edgar L. Erickson, 317 Lincoln Hall, Urbana, Illinois.

California

The Bancroft Library announces the appointment of Andy Wilkison as librarian, senior grade, in place of David Davies, effective August 1, 1941.

Florida

The Union Catalogue of Floridiana, which is being developed at Rollins College under the direction of A. J. Hanna, recently completed its fourth year of activity. Its index and location guide includes manuscript material as well as books. Requests for information as to the location of material on the following subjects are noted in the June progress report: Confederate blockade runners between Florida and the Bahamas, Florida plantations existing prior to 1821, evaluation of historical materials in novels relating to Florida, taverns during the territorial period, and folklore of the St. Johns river valley.

Georgia

The Georgia Department of Archives and History announces the recent accession of collections of letters written by Confederate soldiers, three original Confederate muster rolls, and 159 tax digests. An indexing project is in progress covering Georgia's unpublished colonial records.

Massachusetts

Correspondence of Theodore Roosevelt with Charles G. Washburn, amounting to sixty pieces, has been added to the collections of the American Antiquarian Society.

Michigan

Henry D. Brown has been promoted to assistant curator of the Michigan Historical Collections at the University of Michigan. Among recent accessions of personal papers to the collections are papers of Edwin Denby, Edward Dorsch, Abner C. Parmelee, Fred Newton Scott, and William W. Wedemeyer; student notebook of Byron A. Finney; and microfilms of letters of Father Gabriel Richard. Official papers accessioned include archives of the

history department of the university, manuscripts relating to the "University College" project of 1927, records of the student senate of the university, the Ann Arbor School of Religion, Sanilac Township in Sanilac County, the Brownstown-Taylor Presbyterian Church, and microfilms of the records of Sunshine Community of Saginaw.

The Michigan State Historical Society held its sixty-seventh annual meeting at Ludington on August 16. Among the topics of discussion was the means of promoting the collection, preservation, and publication of materials of local history.

New Jersey

The establishment of an important collection of source materials for research in all aspects of American civilization has been announced by Julian P. Boyd, librarian of Princeton University. The manuscript collection will be known as the Princeton Archives of American Civilization. While its ultimate scope is to be very broad, efforts will be concentrated in the field of literature until methods of collection and organization are perfected. A committee of twenty-two authors, publishers, and scholars has been named to assist in building up the collection. The chairman of the committee is Carl Van Doren.

New York

Dr. Victor Hugo Paltsits retired from active service as chief of the American History Division and keeper of manuscripts at the New York Public Library on June 30, 1941. Dr. Paltsits is a former council member of the Society of American Archivists.

Clifford F. Lord, formerly of the faculty of Columbia University, assumed office October 1 as director of the New York Historical Association. Mr. Lord succeeds Dr. Edward P. Alexander, who resigned from that position to become director of the Wisconsin State Historical Society effective the same date.

A training course on "Resources and Methods of the American Historical Society Library and Museum" will be given by Alexander J. Wall, director of the New York Historical Society, in the spring of 1942. The course will be given jointly under the auspices of that society and Columbia University, and will be limited to ten approved Columbia students. The plan announced is "to familiarize advanced students in American history with the practical operations of a leading historical society and museum, to acquaint them first-hand with methods and problems of collecting and caring for manuscripts, prints, maps, historical relics, etc., to introduce such students to a wide range of basic source-material, and to offer them some training for future work in public archives and in state or local historical societies and museums."

Records of the New York World's Fair of 1939-1940, amounting to ten tons and including correspondence, press clippings, signatures of distinguished

guests, financial documents, photographs and other materials, have been presented to the New York Public Library. The files of the United States World's Fair Commission, which operated the federal building and the buildings in which some of the foreign exhibits were located, have been sent to the National Archives.

North Carolina

Miss Geraldine Coburn has been appointed an archival attendant in the search room of the North Carolina Historical Commission. Recent accessions to the collections of the commission include records of the North Carolina Railroad Commission, 1891-1899, the North Carolina Corporation Commission, 1899-1934, and the North Carolina Banking Commission which was a division of the Corporation Commission. One hundred forty-five volumes of records of Wake County have also been received, including minutes of pleas and quarter sessions of court, 1787-1868, and guardianship, estate, trial, execution, accounting and other records dated between 1772 and 1936. State papers acquired include correspondence of Clyde R. Hoey, governor from 1937 to 1941, Council of State minutes, and commission books.

Ohio

More than ten thousand manuscript items are included in the papers of A. L. Conger, member of the Republican National Committee in the eighties and nineties, which have been acquired by the Hayes Memorial Library. Curtis W. Garrison, director of research, announces the promotion of Jennie Belle Campbell to cataloguer.

Recent personnel changes at the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society include the appointment of Bertha Josephson as secretary to the editor and librarian, and editorial associate, and Harold O'Neal, in charge of the Department of Manuscripts and State Archives.

Rhode Island

Edna M. Worthington, in charge of special collections at the Brown University Library, resigned from that position effective August 31, and was succeeded by Joseph S. Jackson, according to an announcement by Henry B. Van Hoesen, librarian.

Virginia

Dr. William D. Hoyt, Jr., has been appointed to take charge of newspapers in the Rare Books and Manuscripts Division of the Alderman Library, University of Virginia, to succeed Dr. Glenn Curtis Smith, who resigned.

A provisional list of alumni, grammar school students, members of the faculty, and members of the Board of Visitors of the College of William and

Mary, from 1693 to 1888 has been published by the college as an appeal for additional information. This is a part of a two-year project under the direction of Dr. Earl G. Swem, librarian, for which the General Assembly of Virginia granted $15,000. Research assistants have collected manuscripts and made notes, transcripts, and photocopies from various depositories. Important accessions to the library's manuscript collection include large bodies of Billups family papers, 1757-1855, Alexander Brown papers, 1757-1913, Cabell papers, 1719-1839, Samuel Paul papers, 1860-1900, Ritchie-Harrison papers, 1830-1932, Robb family papers, 1757-1898, John W. Wayland papers, 1920-1940, and a number of smaller groups. The oldest of them are among the Mason papers, 1706-1860. Robert H. Land was appointed archivist at William and Mary, July 1, 1941, succeeding John S. Hudson and John M. Jennings, successively acting archivists.

Washington

Among a number of laws relating to historical activities passed by the 1941 session of the Washington state legislature, one provides control of the disposition of public records (*Session Laws of 1941,* Chap. 109). Certain materials not related to accounting records shall be reviewed by an advisory committee to determine their possible historical or administrative value. The advisory committee consists of the state librarian and two historians, one appointed by the president of the University of Washington, the other by the president of the State College of Washington. A committee of the supervisor of the division of the budget, the state auditor, the secretary of state, and the attorney general determines what records are to be destroyed. Other laws protect archeological remains and materials, create a state library commission, make the State Capitol Historical Association trustee for the state for the collection of historical materials, and make certain courses in history and government of the state and nation prerequisites for graduation from schools and teachers colleges.

West Virginia

In addition to the recent appointment of Bess E. Harrison as state archivist and historian of West Virginia, appointments have been announced of Nancy Wilson as state librarian and Cecil Goddall as editor of the state historical magazine, *West Virginia History.*

INDEX

THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST

Volume IV (1941)

"Administrative History in Federal Archives," by Karl L. Trever, 159-169.
Air Raid Precautions in Museums, Picture Galleries and Libraries, reviewed, 194-196.
Almond, Nina, and Harold Henry Fisher, *Special Collections in the Hoover Library on War, Revolution, and Peace,* reviewed, 122-125.
Angel, Herbert E., reviews *Special Collections in the Hoover Library on War, Revolution, and Peace,* by Nina Almond and Harold Henry Fisher, 122-125.
"Archival Maps as Illustrated by Those in the National Archives," by W. L. G. Joerg, 188-193.
Archives and Libraries, edited by A. F. Kuhlman, reviewed, 202-203.
"Archives and Libraries, a Comparison Drawn," by Margaret C. Norton, reviewed, 291-292.
"Archives and Local Administrative History," by George M. McFarland, 170-177.
Archives, bibliothèques et musées de Belgique, XV (1938), Nos. 1, 2, abstracted, 72-74.
Archives de la Province de Québec. Inventaire des Papiers de Léry conservés aux Archives de la Province de Québec, par Pierre-Georges Roy, reviewed, 47-48.
"Archives of New York, The," by Edward F. Rowse, 267-274.
"Archivist in Times of Emergency, The," by Waldo G. Leland, 1-12.
Art and Technique of Administration in German Ministries, The, by Arnold Brecht and Comstock Glaser, reviewed, 196-198.
"Baldassare Bonifacio and His Essay *De Archivis,*" by Lester K. Born, 221-237.
Barrow, W. J., reviews *Protection of Documents with Cellulose Acetate Sheeting,* by B. W. Scribner, 200-201.
Born, Lester K., "Baldassare Bonifacio and His Essay *De Archivis,*" 221-237; abstracts *Archives, bibliothèques et musées de Belgique,* XV (1938), Nos. 1, 2, 72-74; *Nederlandsch Archievenblad,* XLVI (1939), No. 2, and XLVII (1940), No. 2, 74-76.
Brecht, Arnold, and Comstock Glaser, *The Art and Technique of Administration in German Ministries,* reviewed, 196-198.
Brown, Lloyd A., *Notes on the Care and Cataloguing of Old Maps,* reviewed, 283-284.
Buck, Solon J., "The Training of American Archivists," 84-90.
Bullock, Helen Duprey, "The Papers of Thomas Jefferson," 238-249.
Business Historical Society, *The Preservation of Business Records,* reviewed, 42-43.
Calendar of the Stevens Family Papers, prepared by the Historical Records Survey, reviewed, 287-288.
Calendar of the White Collection of Manuscripts in the Public Archives of Nova Scotia, A, compiled by Margaret Ells, reviewed, 287-288.
Cannon, Carl L., editor, *Guide to Library Facilities for National Defense,* reviewed, 198-200.
Cappon, Lester J., "The Fourth Annual Meeting of the Society of American Archivists," 13-25.
"Challenge of Historical Materials, The," by Richard B. Morris, 91-116.
Chatfield, Helen, reviews *The Art and Technique of Administration in German Ministries,* by Arnold Brecht and Comstock Glaser, 196-198.
Coleman, Christopher B., "Some Problems of State Archival Administration," 149-158.
"Confederate Judicial Records," by William M. Robinson, Jr., 117-121.

Connor, R. D. W., "Dedication of the Archival Section of the Alabama World War Memorial Building," 77-83.

Crittenden, C. C., "Some Problems of State Archival Administration," 262-266; reviews *Preliminary Inventory of the War Industries Board Records*, by the National Archives, 286-287.

Davis, Charles S., "Extension Service Records in Alabama," 275-280.

"Dedication of the Archival Section of the Alabama World War Memorial Building," by R. D. W. Connor, 77-83.

Der Archivar, von Heinrich Otto Meisner, reviewed, 288-291.

Dominion of Canada. Report of the Public Archives for the Year 1939, reviewed, 128-129.

30 Bericht des Schweizerischen Wirtschaftsarchivs in Basel für das Jahr, 1939, reviewed, 126-127.

Duniway, David C., reviews *Functional File Classification, . . .*, by J. B. Speer, 284-286.

Eighteenth Biennial Report of the North Carolina Historical Commission, 1938-1940, reviewed, 126.

El Arte de Organizar Bibliotecas, Archivos y Reparticiones en General, by Eduardo Mujica Farias, reviewed, 44-45.

Ells, Margaret, compiler, *A Calendar of the White Collection of Manuscripts in the Public Archives of Nova Scotia*, reviewed, 287-288.

"European Experiences in Training Archivists," by Ernst Posner, 26-37.

"Extension Service Records in Alabama," by Charles S. Davis, 275-280.

Farias, Eduardo Mujica, *El Arte de Organizar Bibliotecas, Archivos y Reparticiones en General*, reviewed, 44-45.

Fisher, Harold Henry, and Nina Almond, *Special Collections in the Hoover Library on War, Revolution, and Peace*, reviewed, 122-125.

"Fourth Annual Meeting of the Society of American Archivists, The," by Lester J. Cappon, 13-25.

Functional File Classification, a Plan of Filing Correspondence and Other Papers According to the Functions, Tasks, or Activities of the Business, Originally Prepared for Montana State University, by J. B. Speer, reviewed, 284-286.

Gaus, John M., and Leon O. Wolcott, *Public Administration and the United States Department of Agriculture*, reviewed, 281-283.

Glaser, Comstock, and Arnold Brecht, *The Art and Technique of Administration in German Ministries*, reviewed, 196-198.

Glenn, Bess, reviews *Guide to Library Facilities for National Defense*, edited by Carl L. Cannon, 198-200.

Guide to Library Facilities for National Defense, edited by Carl L. Cannon, reviewed, 198-200.

Guide to the Material in the National Archives, by the National Archives, reviewed, 38-39.

Hamer, Philip M., *Instructions for the Compilation of Ship Registers and Enrollments*, reviewed, 39-42.

Harris, Collas G., reviews *Air Raid Precautions in Museums, Picture Galleries and Libraries*, 194-196; *Observations Concerning the Conservation of Monuments in Europe and America*, by the National Park Service and Hans Huth, 194-196.

Hayes Memorial Library, *Annual Report, 1939-40*, reviewed, 125.

Holdcamper, Forrest R., reviews Ship Registers of Massachusetts: *District of Barnstable, 1814-1913; Dighton-Fall River, 1789-1938; District of New Bedford, 1796-1850; District of Newburyport, 1789-1908; District of Plymouth, 1789-1908*; and *Instructions for the Compilation of Ship Registers and Enrollments*, by Philip M. Hamer, 39-42.

Huth, Hans, collaborator, and the National Park Service, *Observations Concerning the Conservation of Monuments in Europe and America*, reviewed, 194-196.
Joerg, W. L. G., "Archival Maps as Illustrated by Those in the National Archives," 188-193.
Kuhlman, A. F., editor, *Archives and Libraries*, reviewed, 202-203.
Larson, Harold, reviews *Meddelanden från Svenska Riksarkivet för År 1938*, 45-46; *1939*, 201-202.
Leahy, Emmet J., reviews *30 Bericht des Schweizerischen Wirtschaftsarchivs in Basel für das Jahr, 1939*, 126-127.
Leland, Waldo G., "The Archivist in Times of Emergency," 1-12; reviews *Guide to the Material in the National Archives*, by the National Archives, 38-39.
Lewinson, Paul, reviews *Archives and Libraries*, edited by A. F. Kuhlman, 202-203.
Lokke, Carl Ludwig, reviews *Der Archivar*, von Heinrich Otto Meisner, 288-291.
McFarland, George M., "Archives and Local Administrative History," 170-177.
Meddelanden från Svenska Riksarkivet för År 1938, reviewed, 45-46; *1939*, 201-202.
Morris, Richard B., "The Challenge of Historical Materials," 91-116.
National Archives, the, *Guide to the Material in the National Archives*, reviewed, 38-39.
National Park Service, the, and Hans Huth, collaborator, *Observations Concerning the Conservation of Monuments in Europe and America*, reviewed, 194-196.
Nederlandsch Archievenblad, XLVI (1939), No. 2, and XLVII (1940), No. 2, abstracted, 74-76.
Newsome, A. R., reviews *Dominion of Canada. Report of the Public Archives for the Year 1939*, 128-129.
Norton, Margaret C., "Archives and Libraries, a Comparison Drawn," reviewed, 291-292; reviews *Eighteenth Biennial Report of the North Carolina Historical Commission, 1938-1940*, 126.
Notes on the Care and Cataloguing of Old Maps, by Lloyd A. Brown, reviewed, 283-284.
Nuermberger, Ruth K., "A Ten Year Experiment in Archival Practices," 250-261.
Nute, Grace Lee, reviews *A Calendar of the White Collection of Manuscripts in the Public Archives of Nova Scotia*, compiled by Margaret Ells, 287-288; *Calendar of the Stevens Family Papers*, 287-288.
Observations Concerning the Conservation of Monuments in Europe and America, by the National Park Service and Hans Huth, reviewed, 194-196.
Overman, William D., reviews *The Preservation of Business Records*, prepared by the Business Historical Society, 42-43.
Paape, Charles W., reviews *Tenth Annual Report of the Archivist, University of Virginia Library, for the Year 1939-40*, 128.
"Papers of Thomas Jefferson, The," by Helen Duprey Bullock, 238-249.
Platt, Elizabeth T., reviews *Notes on the Care and Cataloguing of Old Maps*, by Lloyd A. Brown, 283-284.
Posner, Ernst, "European Experiences in Training Archivists," 26-37.
Preliminary Inventory of the War Industries Board Records, prepared by the National Archives, reviewed, 286-287.
Preservation of Business Records, The, prepared by the Business Historical Society, reviewed, 42-43.
Protection of Documents with Cellulose Acetate Sheeting, by B. W. Scribner, reviewed, 200-201.
Public Administration and the United States Department of Agriculture, by John M. Gaus and Leon O. Wolcott, reviewed, 281-283.
Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1937-1938, reviewed, 47-48.
Riepma, Siert F., "A Soldier-Archivist and His Records: Major General Fred C. Ainsworth," 178-187.

Robinson, William M., Jr., "Confederate Judicial Records," 117-121.
Rowse, Edward F., "The Archives of New York," 267-274; reviews *Archives de la Province de Québec. Inventaire des Papiers de Léry conservés aux Archives de la Province de Québec*, par Pierre-Georges Roy, 47-48; *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1937-1938*, 47-48.
Roy, Pierre-Georges, *Archives de la Province de Québec. Inventaire des Papiers de Léry conservés aux Archives de la Province de Québec*, reviewed, 47-48.
Schellenberg, Theodore R., reviews *Public Administration and the United States Department of Agriculture*, by John M. Gaus and Leon O. Wolcott, 281-283.
Scribner, B. W., *Protection of Documents with Cellulose Acetate Sheeting*, reviewed, 200-201.
Ship Registers of Massachusetts: *District of Barnstable, 1814-1913; Dighton-Fall River, 1789-1938; District of New Bedford, 1796-1850; District of Newburyport, 1789-1908; District of Plymouth, 1789-1908;* Philip M. Hamer, *Instructions for the Compilation of Ship Registers and Enrollments*, reviewed, 39-42.
Shipman, Fred W., reviews Hayes Memorial Library, *Annual Report, 1939-40*, 125.
"Soldier-Archivist and His Records: Major General Fred C. Ainsworth, A," by Siert F. Riepma, 178-187.
"Some Problems of State Archival Administration," by Christopher B. Coleman, 149-158.
"Some Problems of State Archival Administration," by C. C. Crittenden, 262-266.
Special Collections in the Hoover Library on War, Revolution, and Peace, by Nina Almond and Harold Henry Fisher, reviewed, 122-125.
Speer, J. B., *Functional File Classification, a Plan of Filing Correspondence and Other Papers According to the Functions, Tasks, or Activities of the Business, Originally Prepared for Montana State University*, reviewed, 284-286.
"Ten Year Experiment in Archival Practices, A," by Ruth K. Nuermberger, 250-261.
Tenth Annual Report of the Archivist, University of Virginia Library, for the Year 1939-40, reviewed, 128.
"Training of American Archivists, The," by Solon J. Buck, 84-90.
Trever, Karl L., "Administrative History in Federal Archives," 159-169.
Van Schreeven, William J., reviews "Archives and Libraries, a Comparison Drawn," by Margaret C. Norton, 291-292.
Wolcott, Leon O., and John M. Gaus, *Public Administration and the United States Department of Agriculture*, reviewed, 281-283.
Wright, Almon R., reviews *El Arte de Organizar Bibliotecas, Archivos y Reparticiones en General*, by Eduardo Mujica Farias, 44-45.

Vol. 4.

THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST

January, 1941

Published quarterly by

THE SOCIETY OF AMERICAN ARCHIVISTS

THE SOCIETY OF AMERICAN ARCHIVISTS

Officers

WALDO GIFFORD LELAND, *president* PHILIP COOLIDGE BROOKS, *secretary*

HERBERT A. KELLAR, *vice president* JULIAN PARKS BOYD, *treasurer*

Council Members

ROBERT DIGGES WIMBERLY CONNOR MARGARET CROSS NORTON

WILLIAM D. MCCAIN MORRIS L. RADOFF

LAWRENCE COUNSELMAN WROTH

THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST

Editorial Board

CHRISTOPHER BUSH COLEMAN EDNA LOUISE JACOBSEN

LUTHER HARRIS EVANS HERBERT INGRAM PRIESTLEY

THEODORE CALVIN PEASE, *managing editor*

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, *sponsor*

THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October by the Society of American Archivists at 450 Ahnaip Street, Menasha, Wisconsin.

Subscription price five dollars per year.

Entered as second-class matter February 5, 1938, at the post office at Menasha, Wisconsin, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

All contributions should be addressed to the Editor, 418 Lincoln Hall, Urbana, Illinois. Subscriptions and communications should be sent to 450 Ahnaip Street, Menasha, Wisconsin, or the Secretary, Box 6154, Washington, D.C.

PRINTED BY GEORGE BANTA PUBLISHING COMPANY, MENASHA, WISCONSIN